STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1936 NUMBER 1139

Contents

The Week 209
Editorials
Trying to Smear Roosevelt 211
One-Way Neutrality 212
The Case of Lawrence Simpson 213
Will China Start the War 214
General Articles
The French People's Front ... Haakon M. Chevalier 215
Hearst Fights the Spanish Republic ... Evelyn Seeley 217
Duke: But Not Doris ..... Ernest Seeman 220
How They Are Voting 223
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 225
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 226
The Bandwagon 227
Correspondence 227
Ballads in Mississippi: II ..... Stark Young 229
Books in Review
In the Shadow of Yesterday ..... Lewis Mumford 230
Orestes in Alabama ..... Hamilton Basso 231
Was Harvard Worth While? ..... Conrad Aiken 231
Understanding Karl Marx: A Debate .....
..... Herman Simpson and Sidney Hook 232
Parable of Youth ..... Louis Kronenberger 234
Books in Brief 235

The Week

WHILE news reports from Spain continue to be confused, unreliable and contradictory, the rebels again seemed to have some advantage in the week ending September 22. This advantage is partly and perhaps wholly the result of aid from Italy and Germany. . . . The prospect of open fighting in the Far East grew stronger as Japan landed substantial military forces in the Hankow area, ostensibly in reprisal for the killing of her nationals by Chinese mobs, but actually, so observers on the scene believe, as part of the long continued Japanese policy of breaking up China into a series of "autonomous republics" all under Japan's control. . . . The League Council reassembled at Geneva with every advance indication that Ethiopia's membership would be canceled and all penalties against Italy revoked. . . . While Europe still reverberated with Hitler's amazing verbal attacks upon Soviet Russia, war games began in both countries. The German military force is the largest since 1914. . . . Bomb explosions in Havana, which may or may not have been the work of *agents provocateurs*, had the customary result of filling the jails with scores of persons known or suspected to be opposed to the present government.

AS MOST of the reliable national polls continued to indicate that President Roosevelt's reëlection is probable, W. R. Hearst and the National Republican Committee over the week-end of September 20 united in a desperate attempt to frighten off the voters with a Red bogey. . . . The President announced several long-range plans in the general field of conservation and assistance to agriculture. One committee, under Secretary Wallace, will deal with a broad farm plan, including crop insurance; another, under Morris L. Cooke, will attempt the rehabilitation of the drought area, and similar activities throughout the nation; a scheme is under way to assist tenant farmers to buy land for themselves on favorable terms, and Mr. Roosevelt called a conference looking toward a possible pooling of publicly and privately owned electric power in the T.V.A. and other regions where such action is appropriate. . . . Governor Landon broke the release date on one of his own speeches in order to hurry aboard the farm bandwagon with a promise that he, also, favors crop insurance. . . . Newton D. Baker announced his belief that it was German submarines and these alone that brought America into the Great War. . . . Alfred E. Smith will take the stump against the New Deal and Democrats are praying that his new speeches may do them as much good as did his famous diatribe before the Liberty League. . . . The International Typographical Union decisively supported John L. Lewis and his C.I.O. . . . The closing ceremonies of the Harvard Tercentenary were dominated by stirring appeals for intellectual freedom in a world where so many barriers to truth have lately been erected. . . . A strike of lettuce-handlers in Salinas brought the customary California accompaniments of vigilante terror and police brutality.

PRESIDENT Roosevelt and Mr. Landon seem to be tumbling over each other in their haste to offer the farmers a new agricultural program, based on crop insurance and Secretary Wallace's "ever normal granary." For months, as readers of the Washington correspondence of The New Republic know, the Department of Agriculture has been working on this idea. It involves, briefly, government holding of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surplus crops in years of natural bounty, to be distributed in years of drought or scarcity. This was the basic plan of the Federal Farm Board established under Hoover, but the new scheme contains essential modifications to prevent the main faults of the Farm Board operations—uneconomic stimulation of production and unsettling of markets by the immense surplus which might at any time be unloaded. Before Mr. Landon had made any speeches dealing with the farm problem, Mr. Roosevelt dramatized his stand by appointing two committees, one headed by Secretary Wallace to prepare a legislative plan for crop insurance, the other by Morris L. Cooke to submit a permanent program to deal with drought and soil conservation. But Mr. Landon hastened to make public in advance a quotation from a future speech advocating crop insurance, saying that he had favored it for a long time. It remains to be seen whether the two programs are different enough to permit a choice on this basis.

A CONFERENCE between T.V.A. authorities and private utilities has been called by the President to work out a system of power generation and distribution in the region, including both private and public agencies. From the technical point of view, general interconnection and unitary management of the electric system in a single region is highly desirable. This is the basis of the English grid, for instance, which integrates privately and publicly owned utilities, and of Ontario Hydro-Electric, which is entirely owned by the province and municipalities. One of the chief defects of the industry in the United States is that it has not gone far enough in this direction, since in many cases several holding-company groups have held subordinate units in the same territory without working out economical methods of interchange. The question is, in this case, whether an agreement can be reached without surrendering to the private utilities the very purposes for which public power under the T.V.A. was established. It was supposed to be a competitive "yardstick" of rates and service, finding its outlet largely through publicly owned distributing units. This program has been blocked by litigation, and contracts for the sale of public power to the big private companies are now about to terminate. Let us hope that the solution will be a well engineered organization to give the best possible public service.

STRAW votes and unofficial polls now in progress all over the country show some contradictory figures, but on the whole the indications seem to favor Roosevelt. Dr. George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion, which operates by means of comparatively small but widespread "samplings" of various classes, groups and localities, in its current figures gives Roosevelt 49.3 percent of the popular vote, Landon 44.3 percent and the remainder to minority parties. On the basis of states, Dr. Gallup awards Roosevelt 275 electoral votes to Landon's 256. It requires, of course, 266 votes to win. In many states the vote is so close that even a slight shift would turn the vote in the other direction, and the alignment of these doubtful states is challenged by both parties. The other major poll, that of The Literary Digest, piles up its authority by actual weight of numbers of votes, rather than indicative samples. In the third week of tabulation, returns from parts of thirteen states give Landon an almost two-to-one lead, with 153,360 votes to Roosevelt's 88,815. In only four states, all of them in the South, does Roosevelt hold the lead. Literary Digest ballots are distributed chiefly to telephone subscribers, of whom there are eighty-seven to every thousand of general population in America, and to automobile owners, who are one hundred and seventy-nine in each thousand. The poll among farmers conducted by The Farm Journal gives Governor Landon a heavy majority, while a poll of school teachers conducted by Dr. George W. Hartmann of Columbia University shows Roosevelt in the lead. The Baltimore Sun poll gives Roosevelt 60 percent of the vote in Maryland, and Scripps-Howard newspapers in five Ohio cities show Roosevelt, 12,870; Landon, 9,129; and Lemke, 1,966. The Fortune Magazine survey favors Roosevelt.

NEGOTIATIONS for the settlement of the strike of 3,200 lettuce workers in Salinas, California, were scheduled to begin on September 22 after three weeks of violent conflict, in which 1,700 citizens were deputized and 150 state-highway patrolmen used tear and nausea gas, as well as clubs, against peaceful pickets. As usual the Red scare has been raised, but this time growers and packers of the Associated Farmers are up against an array of facts that makes their cry of "revolution" pretty implausible. This strike is for union recognition—the first agricultural strike in California with only this demand—and the Fruit and Vegetable Workers' Union is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The State Federation has threatened to institute recall proceedings against Governor Frank F. Merriam unless his treatment of the strike improves. Governor Merriam sent the highway patrolmen to Salinas, although this body is expressly forbidden to do strike duty except when it is incidental to keeping the highways clear. California's trade unions, in fact, are more thoroughly aroused in support of these agricultural workers than they have ever been before, and they are strong enough to do business. Since the growers' refusal to recognize the Salinas union is laid largely to the State Federation's announcement that it intends to organize all agricultural labor, the issue is a basic one—labor's right to organize.

PERHAPS E. Phillips Oppenheim is the only realist, after all; the disclosures of the Senate Munitions Committee certainly make him seem one. Most recently, its report released September 17 disclosed the details of a contract of E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company to smuggle arms into

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany through Holland, in violation of the Versailles Treaty. The contract was torn up the next day, but the other signer of it, "a Mr. Giera, whose real name is alleged to be Peter Brenner and who is reputed to have been an international spy and an agent for thirteen governments," was later paid $25,000. This little incident, although not world-shaking itself—after all, the arms were not delivered—is, we think, precisely the sort of thing the Senate Committee means when it says that "the international commercial interests of such large organizations as du Pont and Imperial Chemical Industries may precede in the minds of those companies the importance of national policy." It also means that the munitions business is organized on a truly international scale, and proves it by disclosing that du Pont interests own over a million dollars' worth of stock in I. G. Farbenindustrie, the huge German chemical trust, and almost as much in another Reich munitions company, Dynamit Actien-Gesellschaft. Moreover, Remington Arms, a du Pont subsidiary, paid royalties to a German "competitor" on sales made to the United States government. In Oppenheim stories all such maneuvering and scheming comes to a happy ending, with only a few villains hurt, but in actuality the munitions trusts and their very businesslike sales schemes are likely to play a large part in dragging us into the worst holocaust the world has ever known. Imagine a company manufacturing rattlesnake poison, and putting on a high-pressure sales campaign for its purchase—and eventual use!

HARVARD'S Tercentenary celebration served as the occasion for the presentation of a notable public statement by twenty-eight Harvard alumni, recalling the actions of the now president-emeritus of the university, A. Lawrence Lowell, when he was the head of an advisory commission to Governor Alvan T. Fuller in the case of Sacco and Vanzetti. The group, which included Heywood Broun, Stuart Chase, Malcolm Cowley, John Dos Passos, Powers Hapgood, Granville Hicks, Walter Pollak and Edwin Seaver, asked all Harvard alumni to study the record of that commission, with particular respect to Mr. Lowell's role, since in the case were involved all the conflicts—economic, social, nationalistic, racial—which are now raging throughout the world. With their statement they gave a resumé of some proceedings of the commission, which they believe show discrepancies between the record and the commission's report, and suppressions of evidence.

AS THE dairy farmers of New York State, asking for living prices after the disastrous drought, called a milk strike for September 24, the consumers in New York City, who will of course have to pay for all increases in the long run, were making plans to carry on the battle against the distributors from their own angle. A mass meeting of the Milk Consumers' Protective Committee, a recent offshoot of Consumers' Union, was held and was addressed by farm leaders, one of whom remarked that it was the first time a dirt farmer had ever spoken to the consumers of the nation's largest city. The Committee already has affiliated with it thirty organizations, including settlement houses, churches and consumers' clubs. These organizations represent about 250,000 milk consumers in New York, and it is hoped that they may eventually be interested in the idea of a milk coöperative, already successful elsewhere in the country. It is perhaps not without significance that the distributors abandoned a previously announced price increase just before this mass meeting, although they had earlier stated that the old price would mean bankruptcy.

TWENTY-ONE years, when one is looking into the future, seems an eternity; looking backward it seems, at least to the editors of this journal, hardly more than a twinkling. In a few weeks The New Republic will observe its twenty-first birthday, and in celebration of that event there will issue from the presses of the Dodge Publishing Company, on September 28, a 640-page New Republic Anthology. Its editor, Mr. Groff Conklin, has diligently searched the pages of this paper from the first issue and has managed to include contributions from a long list of well known writers. We trust Mr. Conklin will not mind our revealing the fact that even this massive volume of 200,000 words contains only about one-third of the material which its editor at first chose for inclusion. The New Republic's editors hasten to add that the paper looks forward rather than backward, and anticipates with all the eagerness of a First Voter the part it hopes to play in American life until its next Anthology is ready—say, in 1957.

Trying to Smear Roosevelt

THE Republican leaders apparently believe that their position in November is desperate indeed. On no other basis can one explain the gutter tactics to which they resorted over the week-end of September 20. Their effort, as every newspaper reader knows, was to "smear Roosevelt" by charging that he has the support of the Communists, to show by inference that he welcomes that support, that members of his administration are revolutionaries and, therefore, that anyone who votes for Mr. Roosevelt's reëlection is supporting red revolution.

Mr. Hearst was the spearhead of the Republican attack, publishing many columns of material purporting to show that American Communists were ordered from Moscow to support Roosevelt and that David Dubinsky and Sidney Hillman, Democratic electors in New York State, are "Reds." On September 22 the Republican National Committee issued a statement, based on a book by George N. Peek, that "men who advocated revolution, who calmly discussed the amount of 'blood that ought to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be shed,' are still in Roosevelt's confidence and controlling his actions."

It is a question whether anyone should bother to attempt to answer Hearst; certainly it seems that Mr. Roosevelt made a mistake if the reply to the Hearst charges made by one of the White House secretaries, Stephen Early, was published with the President's foreknowledge. Repeatedly in the past forty years it has been demonstrated that Hearst's political influence is far less than might be assumed from the circulation of his papers, and the accusations made in his columns have little effect. Hearst's most important bit of evidence, a statement by Earl Browder, Communist presidential candidate, has been shown by its author to be a garbled version of a remark that the Communists could conscientiously maintain a united front, on other immediate issues, with labor elements which are supporting Roosevelt. To label Hillman and Dubinsky as Communists seems the work of a madman in view of their long struggle with the Communist elements in their unions. They are progressive trade-union leaders who favor a labor party of American origin and philosophy.

Hearst himself in one of his characteristic long, rambling and badly written statements, insisted that he never said whether the President "willingly or unwillingly" received the support of radicals. Evidently he hasn't been reading his own papers, which, to the extent of dozens of columns every day, have done their best to show that the New Deal is revolutionary. Here, for example, are a few headlines from the first two pages of The New York American of September 22, the day following the Hearst statement just mentioned: "Roosevelt has Browder's aid, says Upton Sinclair. . . . Lefts unite"; "Rep. Reece hits at President's Red following"; "Defeat Roosevelt Reds—MacNider"; "New Deal still aims at socialist state"; "Social-laborite says Communists back Roosevelt."

The truth of all this hullabaloo can be stated in a few words. It is perfectly true that intelligent American Communists believe the country would be better off under Roosevelt than under Landon. So do millions of other Americans. It should be obvious that Mr. Roosevelt is not responsible for the views of everyone who votes for him. If he gets the support of the Holy Rollers, that does not mean that he is a member of the Holy Roller faith. His explicit statement that he does not ask the support of any "individual or group taking orders from alien sources" ought to end this particular piece of Hearst nonsense once and for all.

Far more serious, in the long run, is the action of the Republican National Committee in disseminating George Peek's nonsensical charges. Peek turns out to be another Dr. Wirt, whose sense of humor apparently is not sturdy enough to keep him from going to a dinner party and then retailing in all seriousness conversation which was obviously intended in jest—if, indeed, it ever took place at all. None of the men he quotes has ever said publicly any of the things attributed to him; none of their official acts, or any other official acts of the Roosevelt administration, has looked even remotely in the direction suggested. Anyone who still believes that the New Deal is or has been socialistic is invited to listen to what the Socialists say about it. And of course the Socialists do not want bloodshed. For our part, our chief grievance against the Roosevelt administration has been the very fact that it has done so little even to reform private capitalism—to say nothing of attempting its abolition.

It is our judgment that the action of the Republican National Committee has put Governor Landon in a perilous position from which he can only extricate himself by an instant and decisive repudiation of this sort of nonsense. Time and again, in the past, the American people have refused to be frightened by the Red bogey, and have reacted against those who have sought to raise it. The list of individual Red hunters whose public careers have been blighted by such activities is a long and disturbing one. If the best case that can be made for Governor Landon is to raise a wholly false and unrealistic issue of radicalism, why should anybody vote for him?

One-Way Neutrality

WHEN THE European powers agreed not to ship arms to either side in the Spanish revolt, Portugal consented only with reservations and did not attend the London meeting of the international committee having charge over the administration of the agreement. Portugal is under a fascist dictatorship and makes no bones about her opposition to the government forces.

A correspondent of The New York Times, Mr. Frank L. Kluckhorn, recently sent an enlightening dispatch to that paper from Lisbon. He visited, at No. 28 Rua Castilho, the open agency purchasing supplies for the Spanish rebels. There he found the Marquis Villarutia, former second secretary of the Spanish Embassy to Portugal, the Marquis de Quintinar, head of the Lisbon representation of the Burgos Defense Junta, and José Maria Gil Robles, former head of the Catholic party in the Spanish parliament, who signs checks. Marquis Villarutia Mr. Kluckhorn saw "in conference with a German salesman who is displaying pictures of motor trucks and other pictures showing how these may be converted into tanks." He was interrupted "by a phone call to this headquarters from the non-interventionist German Ambassador." Several weeks ago arms were openly landed from two German ships. Mr. Kluckhorn discovered no evidence that they were now being delivered, "although ships of nations favoring the Spanish rebels have been arriving here in exceptionally large numbers," and caravans are rumbling toward the Spanish frontier bearing "unknown products covered carefully by sheets of canvas."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This office also acts as headquarters for rebel officials arriving from Seville and other Spanish points, while cables and telegrams for rebel generals pass through Lisbon, both from without Spain and within it. At the same time the Portuguese border is closed to loyalists.

An Associated Press dispatch declares that the Spanish government will shortly protest to the League of Nations against support of the rebels by Germany, Italy and Portugal, and will back the protest with what is considered incontrovertible evidence. In addition, the government announced the capture of an Italian aviator who had been fighting against it, and the killing in action of other Italian and German fliers. On the same day a dispatch from Barcelona quoted the Anarcho-Syndicalist newspaper, Solidaridad Obrera, to the effect that Majorca, one of the Balearic Islands, is now in substance Italian territory, an Italian lieutenant named Rossini having established a virtual dictatorship, and the Italian flag being flown. The Times correspondent warns that this paper may be unreliable, but points out that some of the statements in its article tally with his own information—that for instance, eleven Italian planes had landed at Majorca, that it is equipped with at least eight foreign anti-aircraft guns which have recently arrived, and that Italian vessels are discharging war materials at its port of Palma. It is also reported that Juan March, the banker who is supposed to be a principal financial backer of the rebellion, is there, and that the Spanish civil governor was deposed when he objected to the presence of Italian officers.

It may be that the government itself is also receiving arms, supplies and personal assistance in spite of the non-intervention pact. A circumstantial report appeared several weeks ago of a steamer laden with contraband on its way from Mexico. But the chances are that any material it is smuggling through the embargoes placed by the French and British governments on shipments from those nations—its nearest and most normal sources of supply—is trivial compared with the aid the rebels are obviously receiving.

The situation calls for a thorough and prompt investigation. Portugal is supposed to be under British diplomatic influence; one wonders whether the Foreign Office in London is disposed to wink at what is going on there, in spite of the fact that Great Britain was one of the most ardent advocates of the non-intervention agreement. The understanding was devised to keep the Spanish war from spreading; but there is imminent danger in regarding it as an empty formula that may be violated with impunity so long as it serves its main purpose. For the facts are sure to become known, and the strong sympathy for the Spanish government in France or elsewhere will not permit a cynical and one-way neutrality long to be tolerated. Either non-intervention must be impartially enforced or general intervention will follow.

The line of argument stressed by The London Economist and other responsible British journals seems to us extremely forceful, and we hope the British and French governments will promptly act upon it. International law and custom made it perfectly proper to aid the Spanish government while denying help to the rebels. This would have been the normal procedure. It is, furthermore, greatly to the interest of both these powers that a military government under Italian or German influence not be set up in Spain. When, consequently, in the service of international peace they waived their rights and their interests by promoting general non-intervention, they made a genuine sacrifice. They must in return demand that the agreement be strictly observed. They are quite justified in using their naval and military power to see that it is not violated. Why should not an international police force examine all shipments to Spain, whether through Portugal or France or the Atlantic and Mediterranean ports? Surely Portugal is not in a position to object, France would not do so, and neither Germany nor Italy could with good faith refuse to allow their ships to be searched by an international force charged with the duty of carrying out a pledge that they had made. Indeed, they were at first reluctant to agree to the pact because, as they said, they were afraid it might be violated by France or the Soviet Union. The existence of a competent agency to make certain that it was not being violated by anybody would reassure all and would remove all excuse for further violations.

The Case of Lawrence Simpson

THE POINT-BY-POINT statement of the case of Lawrence Simpson, as embodied in a memorandum presented to Secretary of State Hull by a group of American citizens on Tuesday, September 22, offers the strongest possible basis for action by the State Department. Simpson, a native-born American, member of the International Seamen's Union affiliated with the A.F. of L., was arrested on board the S.S. "Manhattan" by Nazi secret police as the ship lay in harbor at Cuxhaven, near Hamburg. He was charged with having anti-Nazi literature in his private locker aboard the S.S. "Manhattan."

For fifteen months he has been held incommunicado, first in a concentration camp near Hamburg and later at Moabit prison in Berlin. He has never been brought to trial in all that time, nor has he ever been presented with a statement of the exact charges against him. He has been denied the right to select counsel of his own choosing, and his sole defender is a Nazi lawyer who was appointed by the court and who by regulation must be sympathetic to the Nazi regime. Roger Baldwin, of the American Civil Liberties Union, was refused permission to see him, and when Gifford Cochran, an American motion-picture producer, went to Berlin

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at his own expense to aid his beleaguered countryman, he was allowed to interview Simpson only on condition that the conversation be in German, that Nazi officials be present and that the selection of an attorney be the only subject mentioned. Simpson, bewildered and physically ill, suspected some trick and would not grant Cochran the necessary power of attorney.

Throughout the entire proceedings the State Department has refused to make any official representations to the German government, on the grounds that the treatment of Simpson has not differed from that which would be given a German national. The virtue of the memorandum prepared by the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners is that it shows abundant precedents from the decisions of international commissions and the statements of American Presidents to refute this contention and establish the principle that any government has a right to insist upon a fair, speedy and impartial trial for its citizens in a foreign land, regardless of how imperfect and unjust may be the usual legal procedure in that land. The need for the State Department to reaffirm this principle becomes especially acute in view of the fact that the trial of Simpson, before a summary Nazi court whose proceedings are wholly secret, is scheduled to start on September 28.

Will China Start the War

FEARS of international war vibrate more and more rapidly between Europe and the Far East. News that Japanese marines and sailors have been landed in Hankow, and that the Japanese fleet in Chinese waters is being increased, gives evidence of another crisis that may easily result in open hostilities. The immediate occasion of the trouble is a succession of murders of Japanese citizens in China, which will be followed by demands for the "preservation of order" and the policing of additional areas by Japanese troops. But behind this is a clash of nationalisms that for years has been heading toward an explosion that any incident could ignite.

First, of course, came the occupation of Manchuria, the establishment of the puppet state of Manchukuo and the attack on Shanghai. In spite of temporary resistance, the Chinese were not united or resolute enough to attempt permanently to repel this aggression. There followed a long period of Japanese penetration into North-China provinces and inner Mongolia, marked principally by tension with the Soviet Union, against which these activities appeared to be preparing a base of attack. The danger of war here was temporarily averted because Japan was not ready during the period when the Soviet state was weakest, and after that the Russian preparations for defense more than kept pace with the Japanese advance. In the meantime China was occupied with civil war, principally against the Chinese Communists.

Slowly, however, the customary confusion and apathy of the Chinese began to show signs of disappearing. Hostility toward Japanese aggression, combined with nationalist sentiment, present ever since the days of Sun Yat-sen, made rapid headway, particularly in the South. It was only too clear that Chinese weakness offered a continual temptation to Japan, that Japan was exploiting it with methodical thoroughness, and that the island empire firmly intended to become a continental empire as well. At first opposition seemed hopeless, since a disunited China could be no match for a highly integrated Japan. But gradually the conviction implanted itself in aggressive leaders that this view put the case the wrong way about. The means of uniting China would be to fight its historic enemy. On this premise they have been proceeding. Two provinces, Kwangsi and Kwangtung, a few weeks ago actually threatened to fight against Chiang Kai-shek and the Nanking government unless he put up a stiff front against Japan. The Nineteenth Route Army, which had heroically defended Shanghai, also was insistent. This stand aroused so much support that Chiang Kai-shek was forced to conciliate the militants. It is believed that he must either consent to lead an anti-Japanese war or, if he is unwilling to do this, give way to someone else who will. The temper of the Chinese has not been so united and resolute for a decade.

Japan, on her side, may welcome the crisis because, being much better prepared, she believes it would give her an opportunity for a decisive victory. Numerous Chinese leaders, however, seem to have come to the conclusion that they could cause enough trouble to invading armies so that they could hold out for a year, and that by that time other nations would be certain to be involved. They are counting, in fact, on a world war, which would give China a strong government and powerful allies, would smash Japanese imperialism, and would put an end to their present intolerable situation Thus does the pressure of imperialist nationalism lead even the least warlike of peoples to desire a world catastrophe.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1936, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY, BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
REXFORD G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The French People's Front

THE CHANGE of mood that has come over France with the victory of the People's Front is profound and impressive, and constitutes one of the basic factors to be taken into account in evaluating the current situation. After years and decades in which the economic, social, political and spiritual life of France had seemed to be steadily ebbing, something has occurred that has fired the French people with new energy and new hope. The united forces of workers, peasants and lower-middle-class elements have at last appeared upon the political scene. Almost overnight the typical Frenchman has become transformed. He is no longer the rheumatic old gentleman who is afraid of draughts and who sits before an *apéritif* at a terrace table and looks on with cynical indifference while civilization totters, but a vigorous young man who goes out into the street with tens of thousands of his fellows, determined to do something about the intolerable conditions of his life.

The last time I was in France, in 1933, I seemed to see mostly old and ailing people wherever I went. This summer I was struck by the number of young ones. Resignation has given way to resolution. *Changer* has become the most important verb in the French language, and the dynamic impulse behind the People's Front is epitomized in the phrase: *"Il faut que ça change!"* (It's got to change!) Whatever may be the course of events in the immediate future, whether or not the People's Front carries out the program around which the living forces of France are now rallied, that newly awakened vigor which has swept the country heralds a turning point in the history of the nation. A new thing has been born, which must henceforth be reckoned with.

The importance of the People's Front, as distinguished from the "unions," "blocs" and "cartels" of the past, lies in the fact that it is not merely a temporary political alignment, but a consolidation of the forces of the majority of the French nation, who feel themselves in the essential tradition of French republicanism that goes back to the Revolution of 1789. Whether its components be Communists, Socialists, Radicals or members of non-political groups like the C.G.T. (Confédération Générale du Travail) or the numerous professional and cultural associations, they are together and they want to be together. In this vast alliance there is a basic revolutionary dynamism, a willingness to go the limit in order to bring about certain fundamental reforms, which the majority of them believe—with greater or lesser conviction—cannot be achieved under capitalism. The People's Front is a mass movement, whose origins are not merely economic or political. It has a spiritual driving force that points toward a great national renaissance. The phrase *"La France réconciliée avec elle-même"* (France reconciled with herself) has some applicability today for the first time in a generation. The victory over the "two hundred families" has given France back to the people.

The situation for the immediate future, as I gathered it from my observations and numerous contacts this summer, is full of explosive possibilities. The menace of civil war hung over Paris during the whole summer, especially up to the time of the gigantic People's Front demonstration on July 14. There were few actual disturbances of any consequence. But every demonstration had the character of a political act, an affirmation, a threat. There was nothing of what we would recognize as mob spirit. On a number of occasions I saw People's Front groups being baited by much smaller groups of Croix de Feu. In every case they good-naturedly avoided what must have been a powerful temptation to fight. The Right calls them *salopards,* and they don't reject the epithet. The word "monsieur" has taken on unsavory connotations. *Salopard,* by contrast, suggests something natural and robust that savors of the soil. "We may be dirty," one hears them say, "but we're honest and we're strong. And *we* are France." The reactionary press protests with pious horror against the mob rule that has set in since the People's Front has come to power. Yet France has never been more orderly. Popular enthusiasm is not disorder. Meetings and parades are not disorder. The strikes, which involved millions of workers, were conducted—without benefit of party discipline—without violence to persons or destruction to property. The fact is that the People's Front represents *order.* As long as the elements that compose it maintain their unity, order will be kept. The conservatives, the "old republicans," know it, and this is the best guarantee that the People's Front will last.

And this is the answer to the question that one hears everywhere: "How long will the People's Front last?" How long the present government will remain in power no one knows. The chances are that it will last for some considerable time. There will probably be some minor ministerial crises that will bring about changes in the Cabinet—changes that will be toward the Left, rather than toward the Right. The reason why the government is likely to last is that both the friends and the foes of the People's Front realize that only through the People's Front will it be possible to govern at all, by democratic means, in the future.

But the real answer to the question is that nothing short of a fascist coup, which at present is hardly conceivable except through powerful backing by for-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eign fascist countries, will stop the forward movement of the People's Front mass strength. The People's Front will move forward, not to revolution, but to an increasingly powerful organization of workers and peasants and lower-middle-class elements, and to political and economic reforms that will enormously strengthen the people's chances of victory in the class conflicts that may lie ahead.

The government, with its heterogeneous composition, is struggling with vast financial, economic, social and political problems. It has put through, in a few weeks, practically the entire legislative program to which the *rassemblement* pledged itself on July 14, 1935. It has betrayed weaknesses, and has come through somewhat scarred from several of its battles. But most of the bills were passed in the Chamber with tremendous majorities, and went through the Senate relatively unscathed. The government steers a precarious course between the militancy of its mass following, the hesitancy and fears and opposition of the powerful forces to its right in the Chamber and the Senate, and the resistance and inertia of the administrative machinery through which it must function. With the legislative weapons it has forged, its chances of meeting the problems of the near future are good. In administrations, the army, the police, the weeding out of disloyal elements is in process. With its present control over the Bank of France, the establishment of the Wheat Board, the enactment of bills authorizing the establishment of a public-works program, facilitating the amortizing of debts and refinancing of mortgages, extending credit to small enterprisers, simplifying and revising taxes upward, the elimination of fiscal irregularities, and with its continued resistance to the powerful movement for devaluation, the government has at least an even chance of meeting the most urgent economic problems and thus ensuring its stability for the immediate future.

Meanwhile, throughout the country, the tidal wave of mass organization advances. Membership in the Socialist and Communist Parties is steadily increasing. The Communist Party alone has grown from 80,000 this spring to over 200,000. There is increasing talk of a possible fusion of the Socialist and Communist Parties into one big party which would be affiliated with the Third International. This would follow logically from the fusion of the C.G.T. and the C.G.T.U. (the reformist and communist trade unions) which took place last winter. This step would be wholeheartedly endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the rank and file of both parties, who are not conscious of any other difference than that of labels, and would be carrying out the mandate of the people, expressed in the slogan: *"Partout unité!"* (unity everywhere!).

The one great difficulty in the way of such a fusion still remains the question of leadership. It is quite possible that the fusion may be forced through by the pressure of the rank and file. But it is in the trade unions that the organizational growth has been most spectacular. The C.G.T. has increased its membership from 700,000 (the total of the two unified federations before the strikes) to close to 5,000,000. The C.G.T. has thus become the most powerful organization in the country, one that is capable of dominating the political situation in the future. It should be remembered that even the more conservative federation, before the fusion, had as one of its objectives the abolishing of capitalism. One of the clauses of its constitution, dating back to the turn of the century, specifically states:

> The General Federation of Labor, independently of every political, philosophical or religious school, groups all organizations composed of workers conscious of the struggle to be waged for the abolishing of wage-labor and private enterprise (*le patronat*).

Léon Jouhaux, president of the C.G.T., who until recently was the William Green of the French labor movement, has become its John L. Lewis. Two of his right-hand men are Frachon and Racamond, members of the Communist Party.

Aside from the organizational growth of parties and groupings already established—among which must not be forgotten the numerous professional and cultural organizations, like the Comité de Vigilance des Intellectuels Antifascistes, the Maison de Culture, the Association des Ecrivains et Artistes Révolutionnaires, etc.—the most important development is the rise of a vast organizational movement in the form of local People's Front committees. These *comités* are defense units that have grown up, almost spontaneously, all over the country, in hundreds of localities, for the support of the People's Front, in factories, shops, streets and countrysides. Their importance lies in the fact that they are bringing together great numbers who have never before been organizationally identified with any party or group and are giving these people political education and experience; that they testify to the popular will to give direct support to the movement and not let it become bogged in parliamentary and administrative difficulties, and that the people are ready to defend the movement by direct action, if necessary, if obstruction and sabotage from "above" threaten the collapse of the People's Front.

It is not in the Chamber or the Senate or antechambers or Cabinet meetings or governmental committees or meetings of boards of directors or at fashionable dinners that the future of France is being decided today, but in factories and shops and *bistros* and homes and popular meeting places in hundreds of towns and villages. A vast social ferment is in progress. The political life of the country has entered a stage that is called *"le ministère des masses"*—the ministry of the masses—in which a popular meeting may have a more far-reaching importance than a session of parliament. It was not the political leaders, but the rank and file who were the driving force in the building of the People's Front. At a preëlection meeting Léon Blum was asked the question: "Is it really possible to form a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

united front with Communists and Radical-Socialists?" Blum replied that this was no longer a timely question: "The question today is, is it possible to *avoid* a united front?"

The new spirit that has come into French political life is concretely demonstrated by the close bond that is being developed between the government and the people. Every day, in Paris and in the provinces, huge meetings are held in which Cabinet ministers, deputies and other high governmental officials, together with union leaders, occasional army generals and Communists, appear before huge crowds to report on what is happening in Cabinet and Chamber and Senate and behind the scenes, to explain the problems and the difficulties, and the plans for the future. They demand an expression of confidence, and with special emphasis they explain the important role that the rank and file are called upon to play. They tell them again and again that the success of the People's Front depends on *them,* not on the government. The government needs their direct support, the force of their mass organizations behind them, their discipline. Most extraordinary of all, to one coming from the United States, they impress upon the workers the importance of regular attendance at meetings of their organizations and diligence in carrying on the propaganda work. To hear a government official of a capitalist country urging Communists to be conscientious about attending their meetings is indeed a curious experience.

This contradiction lies at the very heart of the situation in France. Capitalism is being preserved, democracy defended, by the masses through their own extra-governmental organizations with a technique that cuts directly across bourgeois legalism and parliamentarism, while that same capitalism, that same democracy, are being most seriously menaced by those who have the greatest vested interest in them. The Socialists and Communists in the government and parliament do not cease, meanwhile, to expound socialism. At every meeting, whether People's Front, Socialist, Communist or C.G.T., all left-wing elements are given a voice, and all are acclaimed with equal enthusiasm. At every Communist meeting the shout *"Les Soviets partout!"* rises again and again, together with the strains of "The International" and "The Marseillaise."

But, in the phrase of Thorez, *"la révolution n'est pas pour demain"*—the revolution will not be tomorrow. And nothing indicates that anything in the nature of an upheaval is in progress. France is calm, tensely calm. Reactionaries are biding their time and moderate conservatives are resigned to watching the experiment work itself out for some little space. But the social laws that have already been enacted do constitute for the people a new charter of liberties and rights; workers have been invested with a new dignity; steps are being taken to solve fundamental problems that at least have succeeded so far in sustaining a deep current of confidence in the future. On that current are being launched hopes and plans that promise much for the regeneration of France.

HAAKON M. CHEVALIER.

Hearst Fights the Spanish Republic

POOR PROSTRATE Spain," William Randolph Hearst unctuously describes her, speaking from Rome. The press, with a few exceptions, has been unfair to Spain in her crisis, but nobody has so violently shot her in the back, kicked her when she's down, and trampled upon her as has Hearst himself.

The minute the Spanish revolution began Hearst jumped in on the side of the fascists with both hobnailed boots. He was in this country when the fascists launched their attack on the government, and before he left the pattern the war would follow—according to the Hearst papers—was well outlined.

His executives knew the pattern already. It embodies all that Hearst learned about journalism from his coverage of the Spanish-American War, the World War, the Russian Revolution, the rise of Hitler and Mussolini, the general strike.

It was clear at the beginning that the picture must be black and white. The Reds, who really began the war whatever you may think, are—under the blanket term of "communist"—bestial, bloody, dirty-necked, destroyers of the home, despoilers of women, God-haters, enemies of art and beauty and tradition, killers, terrorists. The Whites (not fascists), who were driven into the role of saviors of Spain, are noble, aristocratic, valiant, beauty-loving, family-upholding, pillars of church and society and all the romantic legends of Spain. Now a plan of procedure for presenting this picture.

First, and while Hearst was here, there was the embarrassing question of terms. The Hearst press doped it out like this:

"Rebels," "revolutionists," are bad men—usually communists, certainly "radicals." They were to be called "insurgents." (Later H. R. Knickerbocker, covering for Hearst, called them "Whites" when General Franco requested the press to refrain from "rebels" and call them "Whites" or "patriots.") "Fascist" was barred; "rebels" could be used in heads but not in captions; "government" must be used only when qualified as "radical government"; "loyalist" was banned and a picture caption reading "young people *loyal* to the government" was replated out; the government side must be called "Reds."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With that for a start, Hearst terminology went its logical way. Loyalists were "lust-crazed Communist mobs," "Reds of the tough Basque province," a "taxicab army," "tatterdemalion forces," "terrorists," soldiers in bedroom slippers with "red rags" on their guns; they "harassed" the Whites by "vicious and persistent" warfare, their women were "Amazons," and a headline saying the Reds burned a church "in retaliation" was quickly replaced with one saying the Reds burned a church. The Whites were "bravest of the brave," "gallant," "defenders of Spain," motorized, uniformed, "Spain's best trained troops"; the "romantic" Foreign Legion came to their aid; they "marched" or "stormed"; their women were "young ladies" or "the beautiful señoritas of Segovia."

Hearst started off with four main objectives—to whitewash the rebels, discredit and ridicule loyalists as "communist," build up the rebels as victors, and fight the loyalists with atrocity stories. To accomplish these ends he told some major lies, such as these parallel columns will show:

N. Y. Daily Mirror, page 1 banner, Aug. 26:

PRESIDENT FLEES MADRID

and page 2 banner:

SPAIN'S PRESIDENT IN FLIGHT

Pres. Manuel Azana has fled Madrid and is a virtual prisoner in Valencia, where he went presumably to take ship, the Rebel radio station here announced Tuesday. . . .

N. Y. Daily Mirror, page 2, Aug. 26, buried low in story:

U.P., Lisbon. . . .Rebels asserted they had intercepted radio messages . . . that Pres. Azana had fled from Madrid and was in Valencia, *but this report was denied by a spokesman in the capital* who said the President had returned to Madrid after inspecting Red troops along the northern front.

N. Y. Daily Mirror, page 1 banner, Aug. 25:

REBELS CLAIM WAR WON

N. Y. Daily Mirror, page 6, Aug. 25, only statement to hang such a banner on:

U.P.—Temporarily the rebels appear to be gaining the upper hand.

N. Y. World-Telegram, Aug. 25, U.P. story by Reynolds Packard *from Guadarrama Front: (With the Spanish Rebels)*—On all fronts it is a give and take. The war ends its sixth week and there is a growing conviction among observers that the forces are so evenly divided that it may be weeks or months before there is a decision.

N. Y. Daily Mirror, page 1, Aug. 21, picture:

The caption: Don't shoot! Here is one of the most breath-taking pictures to come out of the Spanish war scene. As Red troops occupied the town of Constantina, they commanded the women to come out of their homes with upraised hands in a search for snipers. Hysterical with terror, some of the women clasp their hands, praying for mercy . . . for their menfolk and themselves. Note the horrified expressions. All the savagery of Civil War . . . in a little Spanish town.

N. Y. Post, same day, same picture:

War looks nice in posters—this picture tells a war phase that is not pretty. It shows troops of the Spanish Foreign Legion—rebels—on the main street of Constantina, Spain, just captured by them. The women come forward in surrender, pleading that their men, loyal to the government, may be spared by the victors. . . .

N. Y. Journal, July 24. Headline on story by H. R. Knickerbocker:

REDS CONTROL MADRID! State of Anarchy Spreads as Food Supply Fails

The accompanying story, under a Burgos dateline, was based on "information received at Rebel headquarters" and "unconfirmed report that Madrid has passed under the control of Communists."

Same story, by Knickerbocker: All day and all night contradictory reports and denunciations are heard over radio stations of Madrid and anti-Madrid forces. Burgos: "Looting and fighting" in Madrid; Azana, "all calm." Madrid: "rebels have been completely annihilated"; rebels, "Madrid lies." . . .

N. Y. Journal, Aug. 3, banner:

RED MADRID RULED BY TROTSKY

London. . . . Leon Trotsky, exiled Soviet leader, and Bela Kun, one-time red tyrant of Hungary, are in Madrid to assist in the organization of a Communist state, according to a London Chronicle dispatch from Hendaye, France. . . . Other agitators arrived on the Russian tankers, which also brought Soviet gold.

This dispatch cannot be checked as no other papers use it here, but Trotsky is in Norway under government guard. Bela Kun is in Moscow.

But Hearst's direct lies are not so dangerous as his consistent steady pattern of distortion. It goes like this:

The Rebels are not to blame for the war, they did not start it, and anyway they are the noble saviors of Spain. Hearst pages are open to them:

N. Y. Evening Journal, July 20, caption for picture of General Francisco Franco: "DID HE START REVOLT?"

Alfonso's Son Lays Revolt to Red Rule

Whatever party labels may be placed on the warring government and rebel factions in Spain, Count Alfonso de Bourbon . . . believes it is really the struggle against communism by advocates of law and order.

N. Y. Journal, July 21:

Franco says aim of movement is to "Save Western Europe from the menace of Russian Communism."

N. Y. Journal, July 21, Universal Service:

An unnamed "army colonel" says, "In the name of my companions I say that we will not surrender. We are not playing politics. We want to save Spain from a regime of bandits. We shall not fire until you fire."

N. Y. American, July 22: GEN. FRANCO CALLED "BRAVEST OF BRAVE."

N. Y. Journal, Aug. 26, H. R. Knickerbocker's interview with Franco under headline: KNICKERBOCKER TELLS OF RED MASSACRES.

The southern commander does not look like a killer . . . eyes black and soft . . . candid sincerity . . . white teeth gleam in his kindly smile. . . . "Red committees of Anarchists, Syndicalists and Communists have taken the executive authority in Madrid and Barcelona to kill and murder as they please. We saw chaos coming and if we had not moved, Spain in three months would have been submerged in our own blood. . . . OURS IS LITERALLY A MOVEMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE."

Soon Hearst had entirely forgotten who started the revolution:

N. Y. Journal, Aug. 12:

. . . Indications arose that the government has resorted to inflation to pay for its bloody war against Conservatives.

Meanwhile, were they fascists? No, indeed, according to the Hearst correspondents. But most of the other news from Spain told a different story:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

N. Y. Journal, July 22, Franco, in page 1 signed article: The present movement against the government is one of Spaniards who have a sacred love for their country.

Karl Von Wiegand dispatch: Workers loyal to the Rightist-democratic ideals are supporting the revolt. . . . The flavor of the revolt, according to the refugees, is definitely pro-democratic.

Hearst did *not* use this U.P. dispatch: Lisbon—July 22, General Franco . . . proclaimed today a military dictatorship throughout the country. He decreed also the dissolution of all workers' organization of any sort. Franco's decrees struck to the heart of the situation. They were the formal announcement to the country as a whole of the aim of the revolt—an army dictatorship and removal of the increasingly great power of the left-wing political and labor elements.

But just in case anybody should call the insurgents "fascists," Hearst was prepared to whitewash the fascists as such:

N. Y. Journal, Aug. 22, George Bernard Shaw:
SPAIN NEEDS HITLER

N. Y. American, same date:
ITURBI SAYS SPAIN NEEDS FASCISM

Who began it, and who is to blame for "poor prostrate Spain"? The Communists, the Reds. H. R. Knickerbocker quotes General Franco explaining who "the Reds" are (The New York Journal, August 26):

> Anarchists predominate . . . not because of number, but because they are the toughest of the Reds. Socialists are just fat job-hunters, but the Anarchists are really tough.

But Hearst lumps them, usually, as "Communist." And communism is, as usual in the Hearst papers, an international and national menace:

N. Y. American, July 22:
Gen. Franco's "historic exclusive article" headed
SOVIET AGENTS RUNNING

"Señor William Randolph Hearst," writes General Don Miguel Cabanellos, head of the provisional government set up by the insurgents at Burgos, in The New York American of August 15, "is one of the few men in the world who have understood what the Communist menace really is before actually experiencing the brunt of it."

Hearst acts accordingly, opens an attack on communism more virulent than usual. On page 1 of The New York American, July 25, a two-column box reads, COMMUNISM: A UNIVERSAL CONSPIRACY. The gist is that "not only are the Spanish radicals and Reds allied with Moscow, but they are now allied with the Radical-Socialist government of France." Later on he offers this:

N. Y. American, July 29,
SOVIET DICTATORSHIP IN SPAIN
front-page box "Ordered by Lenin!"

> Under the Communist program a violent swing to the Left in America will produce, automatically and necessarily, the horrors that exist today in Spain, the same horrors that now threaten France and the violence and infamies of the Bela Kun regime in Hungary and the Lenin-Trotsky rule in Russia.

(Only a few days later, according to Hearst, Trotsky and Bela Kun and "Soviet gold" arrived!)

The top in this anti-Moscow campaign was the day The New York American ran a banner RED MOBS CONTROL MADRID and beneath it a cartoon of Stalin ("Moscow Moves the Puppet") looking very jolly in an expensive red-ink coat.

Ridicule of the Reds runs through the pictures printed in all the Hearst papers, but especially in The New York Daily Mirror:

> Mirror, Aug. 2: Self-exaltation. Once they were ordinary workmen. Then they put gunbelts over their civvies, shouldered rifles and now they are Red militiamen in Barcelona.
> Aug. 4: Lying in a Toledo gutter, four peasant girls joke as they snipe at Rebels.

Hearst wants the fascists to win. He shows them winning, like this:

N. Y. American, July 21, General Queipo de Llano, rebel *commandant of Seville*: "Victory is within our grasp."

N. Y. Journal, July 22, H. R. Knickerbocker from Burgos: Spain's "revolution against the Reds" is winning and the day after tomorrow "Marxist Madrid" will fall.

N. Y. Daily News, July 21:
LOYALISTS CLAIM CRUSHING VICTORY
Jay Allen: The onslaught of generals against the Spanish republic is not keeping to the schedule.

From the first Hearst has spread atrocity stories all over his papers, but when victory for the rebels does not come he spreads them thicker. They are all atrocities perpetrated by the Reds. They are told mostly by obscure and often unnamed refugees and many of them come from Lisbon and Gibraltar, the atrocity-tale centers of this war. When there are not enough in his dispatches, Hearst clips them from The London Daily Mail, a yellow sheet that is noted for out-Hearsting Hearst. Pro-fascist travelers—bankers and priests and hysterical women in particular—are interviewed frantically. James W. Gerard, wartime Ambassador to Germany returning from the Riviera, gets a big play when he says, "If the rebellion is successful . . . the Communists in Madrid will kill every man with a white collar or a dollar before the insurgents are able to establish order."

Some newspapers admit there are atrocities and rumors of atrocities on both sides. But Hearst credits them all to the Reds. He stops at nothing—and some tales are as old as the Spanish-American war.

Typical of the Hearst atrocity story is this:

N. Y. Journal, Aug. 31: REDS BURN 12 NUNS ALIVE. Quoting The London Daily Mail quoting Chas. Sones of Belfast, Ireland: Convent in flames . . . monks beheaded . . . the mob had torn the clothes off 12 nuns and paraded them through the streets. . . . Then oil was poured over the nuns and they were burned alive. I saw the bodies.

It may have come from the same source as this: N. Y. Daily News, Aug. 31, Burgos: A new series of Leftist atrocities, including the burning alive of seven persons at Loyoza because they were suspected of connections with the insurgents, was charged tonight by rebel headquarters. . . . The seven stake victims were tortured to death, said dispatches, as other Rebel prisoners were forced to look on.

(First reports to Rebel headquarters were that seven girls had been burned. Subsequent information revealed the original report was incorrect.)

Knickerbocker, named recently to the "Hall of Shame" by the American Writers' Union, did read-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers one service if they got that far down in his story:

> N. Y. Journal, Aug. 3: Red and White propaganda continues to make the air of Spain a battlefield. "The Reds take no prisoners, but shoot all captives," is repeated daily by the White radio stations in order to properly educate the population.
>
> Burgos today announced that the Reds in Nava del Marques poked out the eyes of the local police, and that Reds in Siguenza, which apparently is not yet completely in the hands of the Whites, dragged the bishop to death behind a motor car. . . . It is also charged that a priest in Robregordo was killed by the Reds before the Whites occupied the village, where another priest "went mad."
>
> It is quite impossible to check the accuracy of these reports, and some of them bear the stamp of improbability on their face. . . . Thus the significance of the following tidbits of White propaganda lies not in their authenticity but in the effect they are expected to have on the population which hears and reads them:
>
> Reds in Buitrago poured gasoline over a youth who confessed his Fascist sympathies, and burned him alive, said one.
>
> A refugee who has just arrived from Madrid reports that . . . on the branches of the trees hang clusters of citizens who have been barbarously outraged while Communists plunder the city.

Yet Knickerbocker himself is handfed at the Rebel trough. Apparently his old training as a reporter for honest newspapers makes him insert a few grains of truth into the Rebel publicity stories that he cables home day after day.

Arthur Brisbane, like The American for which he writes, is not content with the day's crop of atrocity tales, but bases a sob-column on tales from the French reactionary paper L'Ami du Peuple and The London Daily Mail. He writes movingly about "fighters for Madrid's radical government digging up and throwing nun's bodies from graves . . . nuns soaked with oil and burned" and so on.

No correspondent denies that terrible things are happening in Spain. Least of all Jay Allen, who writes the following eyewitness story ending in "Reds Massacred in Spanish Bullring":

> N. Y. Daily News, Sept. 1: . . . This was the upshot . . . thousands of Republican-Socialist and Communist militiamen and militia women were butchered after the fall of Badajos for the crime of defending their republic against the onslaught of the generals and the landowners. . . . Between 50 and 100 have been shot every day since. . . . .

And certainly not Robert Neville, writing from Tangier—

> N. Y. Herald Tribune, Aug. 2: In Gibraltar I found to my surprise that most newspapermen had been sending only "horror" stories. . . . The correspondents have specialized in Red terror, whereas the writer of this dispatch has been the witness of White terror in Granada for 23 days.

But to Hearst and his Brisbane the "truth" is one side of the story only, and that side distorted until it would be ridiculous if it were not so tragic.

EVELYN SEELEY.

Duke: But Not Doris

AS THE traveler enters the little city of Durham, North Carolina, the first thing he notices is the all-pervading smell of tobacco that fills the air. Its significance is more than olfactory. Tobacco built Durham—or to state it more correctly, the Dukes built Durham. It is one of those peculiarly American cities whose whole economic foundation rests almost entirely on a single fortune. That fortune, vulgarly associated with the honeymoon of "the world's richest girl," has a loftier symbol in Durham—Duke University, one of the most elaborate educational institutions in the United States.

Duke University began as Trinity College. It was not until James Buchanan Duke endowed it with approximately $40,000,000 that it assumed its present name—under, it might be added, the terms of the bequest. The basis of the Duke millions was laid by James B. Duke's father—old Washington Duke, an unlettered farmer and local manufacturer who got his first real push upward when the Yankee and Confederate soldiers who raided his little plant during the war flooded him with orders after the conflict was over.

Practically illiterate, he was not without shrewdness. As his business grew, there also grew up a sentiment against the use of tobacco. The Methodist Conference demanded prohibitory legislation. About this time the Rev. John C. Kilgo, president of Trinity College, which was then the chief educational institution of the Methodist Church in the Carolinas, called on old Wash Duke for a contribution. Wash was more than generous. He presented Trinity with one hundred thousand dollars—in cigarette stocks! The anti-cigarette campaign languished, then stopped. Dr. Kilgo died a bishop.

It was in the subtler brain of James Buchanan "Buck" Duke, however, that the idea of a world monopoly on tobacco was conceived. Taking his cue from Rockefeller, Frick and other great capitalists, Buck managed, in one way or another, to acquire or ruin practically every tobacco factory in the United States. This accomplished, his American Tobacco Company merged secretly with European manufacturers as the British-American—and then he turned his attention to waterpower. The Duke Power Company first began to operate experimentally in Canada, then concentrated on the Carolinas. Obtaining for practically nothing the vast power resources of their Catawba and Yadkin Rivers, Buck Duke built his second great monopoly. Sated, one of the richest men in the world, he turned his thoughts to higher things. The result was Duke University.

Buck Duke's gift was bestowed as follows: Duke Power Company dividends go to Duke Endowment,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a receiving trust set up in the bequest. Through it Duke University derives its income. The Endowment also aids some fifty orphanages, one hundred and fifty hospitals, three smaller colleges, one thousand Methodist churches and several hundred retired Methodist ministers. Philanthropic indeed was Buck Duke—but so was old Wash, in a way.

As a result of the endowment that gave it its palatial buildings, its vast stadium, its first-rate football team, Duke University is little more, in one sense, than the tail on the utility kite. The kite has to keep up or the tail comes down. For instance, when the county government at Greenwood, South Carolina, applied for a loan of $2,767,000 from the P.W.A. to build a publicly owned power plant (from which it proposed to distribute electricity at a substantially lower rate than the monopolizing Duke Power Company), concerted pressure to have the loan revoked was made by the Duke Endowment, the Duke Power Company and Duke University. Propaganda was piped out to editors, educators, politicians, churches. Earlier, a Senator had lauded the Duke Power Company as a "benevolent and almost religious institution." An orator warned the South Carolina Legislature that if power rates were cut, "the sick and orphaned, the churches and hospitals, the student and preacher would have to pay for it." (Note: Buck Duke reserved for his family 125,904 shares of Duke Power Company stock as against 122,647 shares for all endowment philanthropies combined. The endowments help to guard the family wealth.)

In addition to the enormous power it wields in the Carolinas, the Duke Endowment effectively influences public policy in communities far removed from its industrial operations. For besides its enormous holdings in electric power, aluminum, tobacco, railways, steamships, cotton mills and land, the Duke Endowment has acquired millions of dollars' worth of state and municipal bonds from Alabama to Maine, from the Carolinas to Oregon.

Duke University's concepts of education and public responsibility have consistently been shaped to fit its benefactor's philosophy. Dr. William P. Few, who had been president of Trinity, was continued in this job at Duke. From the standpoint of the trustees of the Endowment, Dr. Few was the ideal man for the job. He was vague in intellectual matters, and one of the rare literary efforts of his long career was an article in Duke University's South Atlantic Quarterly commenting favorably upon the treatment accorded cotton-mill workers by the Dukes. Under Dr. Few's direction Duke University has gone in for display on a big scale—and, also, football. With the inauguration of its building program, massive towers and battlements arose. Artists went to Spain to copy gargoyles; sculptors came from Italy to bring the Renaissance to Durham. A $3,000,000 cathedral, residences for administrators costing as high as $90,000 each, nearly $100,000 worth of bells, a flower bed containing 250,000 iris bulbs alone—these were some of Duke's "educational" projects.

The university has, at various times, posed as a liberal institution. Its conception of liberalism, however, is indicated by a speech delivered before the Bar Association of the Law School in October, 1932, by William R. Perkins, vice-chairman of the Duke Endowment, vice-president of the Duke Power Company and a director of the British-American and P. Lorillard Tobacco Companies. The Endowment, said he, was unequivocally opposed to any "tenets of Socialism" being accorded a hearing in Duke University. "Had the views of this Socialist Party prevailed," he orated, "we would have had no wealth to distribute, by confiscatory taxes or otherwise, no Duke Endowment, no Duke University as we know it today." And a statue of Buck Duke, cigar in hand, stands before the fourteenth-century cathedral.

Along with its general expansion, Duke University launched a publishing and research program. A well endowed press began to function. A professorial committee was appointed to pass on manuscripts, but the university's treasurer had much to do with final decisions. A graduate of Annapolis, impeccably groomed, he knew the names of all the baseball players who had appeared in the world series since he was a boy. Otherwise his qualifications for publishing and editorial duties were, to put it generously, negligible. The Duke Press was soon made part of the general system of ballyhoo. Its chief function was, and is, to kick up a literary dust and give the impression that Duke is being intellectual in a big way.

In the publication line, the zoölogists persuaded the administration to publish a scientific journal, Ecological Monographs. In April, 1933, there appeared in this publication "An Ecological Study of the Tobacco Beetle, with Special Reference to Its Life History and Control," by Thomas E. Powell. The article seemed innocent enough, but as soon as the magazine had time to get to New York, President Few called upon the editor of the journal and the manager of the Duke Press. In his hand he held a telegram from William B. Bell, Endowment trustee and president of the American Cyanamid Company—which manufactures, among many other products, a line of fumigants. Trustee Bell resented the release of a paper that did not rate his chemical products the most effective on the market. The manager of the Duke Press was thereupon instructed to issue public notice that the article had slipped through by "mistake" and that it was "erroneous." This was done. An able and honest scientist was insulted and Trustee Bell was pacified.

In the Chemistry Department valuable research has been done in tobacco—but the Duke Chemistry Department, in this regard, is little more than an extension laboratory for the Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company, in which the Duke Endowment holds 17,175 shares of common stock (A) and 8,451 shares of common stock (B). In the Medi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal School, important discoveries, principally by Dr. Ivan A. Parfentjev, have been made in the field of serums. Such discoveries, however, are not for the public but for the profit of the American Cyanamid Company—three of the officers of that company, including President William B. Bell, being trustees of the Duke Endowment. The Lederle Laboratories, Inc., and the Davis and Geck Company, surgical and medical-supply corporations owned by American Cyanamid, are able, through this tie-up, to derive a steady income from the Medical School and other charitable institutions of the Endowment.

It is not overstatement to say that practically every division of Duke University is being used to maintain the well paid jobs of its officials, to do the bidding of private interests and to check all liberal opinion and expression. For example:

In enlarging its faculty, the university employed Dr. Edmond Soper, now president of Ohio Wesleyan University, as dean of the School of Religion. He was also made a vice-president. Shortly after Dr. Soper's appointment, a new military-appropriations bill was introduced in Congress. Dr. Soper, a sincere and earnest pacifist, petitioned the North Carolina representatives to oppose it. In this he was assisted by several of his friends. He then planned an anti-war rally and asked one of his assistants to invite a friend, Dr. William Louis Poteat, president of Wake Forest College and a prominent pacifist, to speak. Shortly before the meeting was to be held, Dr. William H. Wannamaker, dean of Duke University, sent for the man who had invited Dr. Poteat. He gave him a lecture on the "practical" side of college administration. "What do you suppose Senator Simmons or Senator Overman would think should they hear that Duke University was obstructing a bill in which they were interested?" The impractical Dr. Soper, a short time later, was encouraged to resign. Among his moral and intellectual shortcomings and errors was the fact that he had addressed cotton-mill operatives on the question of unionism.

Further light is shed on this episode by the fact that Duke University, through the Endowment, has a good-sized stake in the armament industry. The Endowment owns 188,073 shares in the Aluminum Company of America, and the American Cyanamid Company, already mentioned, is probably the second largest American manufacturer of explosives, gas, guncotton, acids and the basic chemicals of warfare—outranked only by the du Pont interests. The sagacity of certain of the Endowment chiefs is shown in the fact that their explosives corporation "doubles" in surgical sutures for the wounded, thus reaping a two-way war profit.

The Law School of the University gets out a technical journal, Law and Contemporary Problems. In December, 1933, it published a very scholarly symposium on the Pure Food and Drug Act. Its simple, happy conclusion was that a consumer is entitled, in law and justice, to receive his food and drink from the manufacturer in a pure and unpoisoned condition. This was nothing short of heresy. The Duke Endowment, personified by its trustees, rose on its hind legs and howled. It developed that many of these trustees, especially the officials of the American Cyanamid Company, had been lobbying in Washington at considerable expense to have the measure defeated. The Endowment, again through its trustees, demanded that all Duke law professors aiding the New Deal be withdrawn. Dean Justin Miller of the Law School opposed this demand. He stated, further, that he could not recant the pure-food opinions of his colleagues and that, also, he would not deny the advice of his legal experts to President Roosevelt. The upshot of this incident was that Dean Miller was hounded from office and eventually forced to resign —while Mrs. Roosevelt, on a visit to the university, was lavishly entertained by Dr. Few and tons of propaganda were sent out saying that Duke University and the Duke Endowment were working to assist the President in his social-reform efforts.

Story after story of suppression at Duke University may be told. In the Medical School, Dr. Harold L. Amoss, head of the Department of Medicine and an outstanding scientist of the Rockefeller Institute, was forced to resign when he stood up for ethics versus factory-method economies endangering the lives of patients. In the Economics Department, John P. Troxell, professor of Economics and Business Administration, was "diplomatically" forced out (over the protest of his department associates) because, in a course on labor, he insisted on presenting the workers' side of the picture and because he gave a dinner to Norman Thomas when the Socialist leader visited Durham. In the Law School, Professor Gordon E. Dean, instructor in Law and assistant to Dean Miller, resigned his post because of disagreement with the intellectual atmosphere of Duke shortly before Dean Miller's departure. Miss Eula Van Meter, Dean Miller's secretary, found herself *persona non grata* after her chief had left. Leslie Craven, professor of Law (now counsel to the Federal Coordinator of Transportation), resigned from the faculty after his courses on "Public Utilities" and "Taxation" caused the Endowment to comment (quoting President Few's own words to the author) that "he was not the man we took him for."

It is not startling, finally, that with millions of dollars at its disposal for more than ten years, Duke University has not built a single department that can be rated as distinguished—as pointed out in an article in the June, 1935, Atlantic Monthly by Edwin R. Embree, president of the Julius Rosenwald Fund and formerly vice-president of the Rockefeller Foundation. Duke University has sought admission to the American Association of Universities in vain. It is doubtful, however, if this worries the men in charge of Duke University. They have their own ideas about education.

ERNEST SEEMAN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How They Are Voting

A SHORT time ago, the editors of The New Republic wrote to ninety-seven well known Americans who have in general taken a progressive political position, asking them for whom they would vote in this year's national election. Omitted from the list were all individuals of whose intentions the editors were already aware. Thus far, fifty-four replies have been received, with results as follows:

Roosevelt: 42
Thomas: 8
Browder: 3
Landon: 1
Lemke: 0

In this and subsequent issues The New Republic is publishing, in full or in part, the letters written in response to our inquiry, arranged in alphabetical order. A number of persons ask that their replies be held confidential, and their letters are of course omitted, although their choices are included in the tabulation given above.

I am voting for the reëlection of President Roosevelt. As I see it, the reason why the liberals must support Roosevelt in the coming campaign does not lie so much in the difference between the two candidates as in the difference between the political forces which are behind them. It seems clear to me that Landon, if elected, cannot help being controlled by forces which would lead to disunion in our national structure and impotence of the federal government. Not all of the diverse elements behind the Republican candidate are reactionary in their social thinking. He is supported by the most diverse and irreconcilable groups imaginable, which range from hard-boiled and unhumanitarian reactionaries like Hearst and The Chicago Tribune, to more liberal persons such as Charles Taft.

There may be somewhat the same diversity of support in the Democratic camp. However, it seems clear that all of Landon's various supporters, liberal or reactionary, have at least this in common—they are in favor of stripping the federal government of the power to handle national problems in a national way. They are obsessed with a vague fear of what they call bureaucracy and the absurd idea that dictatorships are the result of a long series of small seizures of power on the part of the central government. Nothing can be more obvious than that the exact opposite is true. Every dictatorship which we now know flowed into power like air into a vacuum because the central government, in the face of a real difficulty, declined to exercise authority and responsibility. In a situation where respectable people of decent social values are too frightened of possible consequences to take vigorous action, it always happens, sooner or later, that less respectable people of lower social values seize the reins of power which have been dropped. This is the history of Germany and of Italy. A long continued failure in the power of the national government of the United States to act as a real national government might, I think, produce similar results. In the meantime, whether the situation ever reaches that extreme or not, a policy of divided power and restricted responsibility would leave the nation subject to the manipulation of small, highly organized, selfish, sub-rosa groups.

Liberals may complain that Roosevelt has not been consistent enough in his support of liberal measures. That, however, is not the issue in the present campaign. Liberals can be effective only by reacting against the established conservative position. If Landon is elected, I believe that the established conservative position would be one in support of a national government that was only a debating society. In such a situation the great humanitarian efforts of the liberals of America would be wasted because there would be no political forces responsible enough to respond to their appeal, even if they were sympathetic.

I decline to support the Socialists until they become less perfectionist in their attitude and show signs of becoming an effective political group with ability to use political techniques. At present theirs is a dream world, suitable only for tender-minded university professors. Their platform is much better than that of the other political parties because they are not actually attempting to get votes by political methods, but only to state principles. We have enough principles already among our liberals. What we need is a better practical realization of actual political situations.

THURMAN ARNOLD.

I'll vote for Roosevelt again, although I am theoretically —no, traditionally—a Republican. I have been vainly waiting for the Republicans to nominate a decent candidate ever since 1912, when, a hero-worshiping, swashbuckling youth aged twenty-one (mental-emotional age eleven), I voted for the great phrase-maker Teddy the Little. Now I admit Frankie the Great is also a Fancy Phraser, but what with the Liberty Boys of '36, the Triumvirate of Senility, Papist Vitriol and Fundamentalist Bombast, and Kansasininity plus Tabloid Noxit, I am afraid that Roosevelt, with all his faults, might be defeated. Then, instead of "grass growing in the streets," I fear blood will flow in them—more blood than has flowed to date. The election of Landon would, I believe, be a triumph for the forces of reaction, exploitation and eventual destruction of American democratic government. I think Roosevelt will be forced farther and farther to the Left by the inexorable pressure of events. This is the way he should go. I feel that every vote cast for Thomas and Browder, possibly 1,000,000 all told, plus the possible 3,000,000 for the Unholy Trinity, may defeat Roosevelt, which, it seems to me, would be an unmitigated calamity.

The New Deal has bungled badly in my opinion, both in policy and performance but there are some sound things which I think are of sufficient importance to merit support from all good Americans; among them I would mention

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the T.V.A.—and all "yardstick" legislation, C.C.C., soil-erosion policies, promotion of consumers' coöperation, securities and exchange law, social security—although it is merely a weak starter—and the housing (slum-clearance) and resettlement program, although they are so far merely drops in the bucket. The relief program was necessary and probably will be for years yet; it has been and still is inadequate and should have been replaced long ago by an intelligent public-works program. We could have had decent roads, decent schools, adequate housing, under and overpasses, reforestation, soil conservation, adequate public buildings and a thousand other necessary and needed permanent improvements if the money squandered in often less-than-subsistence-relief had been spent for labor and materials at a decent living wage. Incidentally, this would have done something significant to end depression.

So all in all, I am ready for four more years of New Deal, hoping that it will get more and more "socialistic," "communistic" or what you will.

READ BAIN.

I think that the Socialists are taking the most realistic view of our dilemma and I would vote for Mr. Thomas if I did not feel so strongly that this is no year to cast a protest vote. I am going to vote for Mr. Roosevelt, therefore, because I don't want to see the snail's pace of progress we've made under the New Deal swallowed up in five furlongs of reaction under Hearst, Landon and the Liberty League. The moral of 1936, it seems to me, is for those of us who want a Popular Front, Farmer-Labor Party in this country to stop sucking our thumbs and theorizing and heaving brickbats at each other and start working toward 1940—which, it now appears, may be the crucial year.

HAMILTON BASSO.

Emerson said of the Abolitionists: "They may be wrong-headed, but they are wrong-headed in the right direction." Candidates for the office of President of the United States (those that have any chance of being elected; the others, knowing well that they will not be called upon to make good, can afford to say what they think, even if they can think straight) are usually (practically always for the duration of the campaign) wrong-headed; but some of them, some of the time, may be wrong-headed in the right direction. The only candidates who have any chance of being elected are Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Landon. During the campaign they and their supporters naturally confine themselves to generalities which, like the famous statement agreed to by the Jansenists and the Jesuits for the good of religion, may be taken to mean one thing or another as you please. Nevertheless, allowing for campaign hokum and the necessary limitations and disingenuousness of minds long habituated by the political game to following the line of least intelligence, it seems to me that there is an underlying difference between the attitude of Mr. Roosevelt and that of Mr. Landon. Mr. Landon believes, or appears to believe, that the economic and industrial problems that are now pressing for some solution can best be solved by reducing the government regulation of private business enterprise to the minimum; while Mr. Roosevelt believes, or appears to believe, that governmental regulation of some sort is essential for their solution. I shall therefore vote for Mr. Roosevelt because I believe that however wrong-headed he may have been and may still be he is at least wrong-headed in the right direction, whereas Mr. Landon suffers the grave disadvantage of being not only wrong-headed but wrong-headed in the wrong direction.

CARL BECKER.

I am voting for Norman Thomas. I shall vote for the Socialist candidate in any case, but I think Thomas stands for a socialism that is both American and undiluted. I also feel that, at present, with so many radical factions, quarreling over inessentials, we need most of all an American "Popular Front," and that Thomas is far and away the best available leader for this.

VAN WYCK BROOKS.

On the supposition that the election may be close, I'm going to vote for Roosevelt, but without enthusiasm. He probably won't do anything *for* those who see him as the nearest available symbol of a People's Front, but he is likely to do less *against* them. And in doing less against them he will be giving them more time and space in which to wake up and organize their own political strength behind their own candidates. I know the policy of the lesser evil has failed in certain European countries; but there is no reason why the breathing space permitted by the lesser evil should not be utilized instead of frittered away.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

Roosevelt—has done better than anyone else could have done.

JOHN R. COMMONS.

I am going to vote for Mr. Roosevelt primarily because of the success of his policies and because of the broad humanity of those policies. I especially like the trend of his policies toward a wider distribution of the annual income of the country. This seems to me to be required in the interest both of social justice and of economic stability. Also, I approve of the tendency of his policies to reclaim for the American people the powers of self-government which judicial interpretation of the Constitution has been filching from them for years. On the other hand, not being one of those who "hate Roosevelt," I am unable to discover any good reason for voting for his opponent. The New Deal no doubt needs to be reformed in certain respects, but like the tariff in times past, "it ought to be reformed by its friends." Finally, I should not care to vote for a governmental stalemate, which is what we should have were Governor Landon to be elected, since there is no possibility of the Republicans capturing the Senate this autumn, and little of their doing so before 1940.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

I expect to vote for Mr. Roosevelt, although I have not agreed with some of his policies. I believe he has, as Stuart Chase says, caused by government spending such recovery as we have; also that by various reforms he has put recovery on as sound a basis as is possible in the existing state of public opinion.

DAVID CUSHMAN COYLE.

(To be continued.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Money Makes the Elephant Go—Business's anti-New Deal Films—Felix du Pont Kids the Stockholders

FROM THE beginning of the presidential campaign, the only significant question has been how hard big business would work and how much money it would spend to bring about Mr. Roosevelt's defeat. Mr. Walter E. Edge, Mr. Clayton D. Buck and the other big-business agents who picked Governor Landon as the Republican candidate are politicians of experience; it is incredible that they should have had illusions about his bumble-footedness as a campaigner. Ever since Mr. Landon's nomination, it has been clear that big business meant to win the election itself, through its own methods of economic pressure.

The big-business drive—which constitutes the real Republican campaign—seems now to have begun. If you were a factory-owner, you would have received during the last ten days a letter from the National Manufacturers' Association enclosing publicity material for a series of anti-New Deal movies for exhibition before your workers. The letter tells its own story:

> National Industrial Information Committee
> of the National Association of Manufacturers
> Inter-Member Memo
>
> Here are the first two Miniature Newspapers highspotting two productions in the Library of Sound Slide Films for employees' meetings sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Industrial Council. Each of the five productions in this program answers major vital national problems—dramatically—interestingly—with the true business facts. Highly effective with employees. "They see it. They hear it. They read it."
>
> Don't let reds, radicals and "ism" cults continue to divide your house against you. Start this popular series for your employees now. It is your duty to protect your property and the American industrial system of which you are a part. A short description of what you need to start this interesting series is enclosed. Fill in the convenient blank—mail it today.
>
> E. T. WEIR.
>
> P.S. All these sound-slide productions have been tried in the field under varied conditions and found effective. If you feel you should see them before approving a "package" order, let us know. We'll try to locate a projector near you. There are over 25,000 in use.

The "Miniature Newspapers" accompanying the letter give sample shots from the movies, together with brief scenarios. Technically, the movies would seem to be mystery novelties, on the order of "Dracula" or "King Kong." The feature role is taken by "Tax-Grabber," an immense papier-maché octopus with a family resemblance to the dim-witted frog footman of "Alice in Wonderland." The straight parts are filled by a young man evidently representing Mr. Average American—whose dress represents a nice compromise between a factory employee and a white-collar worker—and his wife. In the opening sequence they are care-free, happy, and scoff at warnings that the Tax-Grabber is at hand. The Tax-Grabber appears, with appropriate sound effects. It steals food from their breakfast table, sucks gasoline from the tank of their cheap automobile, twines its slimy tentacles around their radio, menaces the future of their children. Another character, a little man with a fuzzy goatee and fuzzy hat, named Uncle Sam, also is pursued by disaster, and is crushed by a big bag he is trying to carry labeled, "$32 Billion Debt."

Mr. E. T. Weir, who signs the letter recommending these movies, is head of the National Steel Company, and one of the chief figures in the Liberty League. As you will recall, he was the complainant in the Weirton Steel case, which prevented Section 7a of the old N.R.A. from being fairly tried out. He was one of the original Landon discoverers and, during the Republican convention at Cleveland, occupied a room not far from Landon headquarters.

Very little imagination is required to understand why, in Mr. Weir's words, these films should have proved "highly effective" with factory workers despite their incredible dullness. If a worker is asked by his plant superintendent to come back at night to see Tax-Grabber waving his eight papier-maché legs, he is likely to get the idea that the company is against Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal. He would get the idea that, if he voted for Mr. Roosevelt, the company would be extremely annoyed, and that his job would not be altogether safe. If this isn't a variety of intimidation, then both Noah Webster and I are wrong.

This is one side of the real Republican campaign; another concerns small stockholders. If you owned a share of du Pont common, last week you would have received a letter from Mr. Felix du Pont enclosing "A Letter to Industrial Shareholders," also the work of the National Manufacturers' Association. In form, this document closely imitates the usual Wall Street market letter. There is no mention of Mr. Roosevelt or the November election. It analyzes New Deal legislation in brief, almost noncommittal phrases, but its total effect is to give the reader the feeling that all stocks will be in jeopardy if Mr. Roosevelt continues in office. At the end, it lists dangerous bills which big business managed to defeat at the last session of Congress. Among them it places Senator Van Nuys's proposed law to prevent employers from bringing pressure on their workers. "The Van Nuys bill," it observes, "would have prohibited employers from attempting to 'influence the vote' of employees through 'influence, fear or intimidation.' It is worth noting that while the bill would have prohibited employers from engaging in such 'intimidation,' it did not seek to prevent government officials or labor-union officials from practising such coercion." This sounds very much like an advance alibi.

According to the Securities and Exchange Commission, there are about 12,000,000 individual stockholders in the country. The vast majority of them are white-collar workers, whose few securities constitute their life savings. It is a fair guess that, before the election, nearly all of them will have received a letter like this one. Offhand, it might seem unbelievable that such blatant propaganda, in the face of a steadily rising market, could influence their votes. But apparently most of these small stockholders are still raw from the beating they received in 1929 and after, and are still panicky. A campaign of fear—even though it comes from the same group that was to blame for the 1929 de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bacle—will test their morale severely. Maine has an exceptionally large percentage of investors in public-utility stocks, and their terror lest approval of the Roosevelt administration might send their holdings down, or at least prevent them from rising, is reported to have been a definite factor in the Republicans' recent victory.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Detroit Business Men Cheer Couzens' Defeat—Couzens Exposed the Detroit Bankers—Now Detroit Wants to Forget

THERE must have been howls of joy downtown in Detroit on September 15 as the election returns brought the joyful tidings of the defeat of Senator James Couzens for renomination. More than one hilarious cocktail, I am sure, was hoisted at the Detroit Club to celebrate this sign of divine justice. For upon no public man in America has such a shower of hatred been loosed as upon Senator Couzens by the banking and financial fraternity of the great automobile city.

Yet the passing of James Couzens from the Senate is one of the gravest losses that body has suffered in many years. Couzens, worth many millions, has been the perfect example of the honest man in politics. He was, indeed, the most intellectually honest man I have ever met in Washington. And this quality flowered in the most extraordinary frankness about every question. He could sometimes bowl a man over with his unexpected frankness. When the late William Woodin was Secretary of the Treasury, his name appeared on several of those preferred lists of the Morgan firm which Ferdinand Pecora exposed in the Wall Street investigation. Many people were demanding Woodin's resignation. The present Republican candidate for President in a speech said the President should remove him. Woodin was flying around Washington in his best salesman's manner asking advice as to his course, but, of course, seeking to be told not to resign. He went to Couzens, whom he knew only slightly. He asked Couzens' opinion. He told Couzens he had not wanted to come to Washington, that the President insisted, that he came only because he wanted to help the President. Couzens replied soberly: "You say you came here first of all to help the President. Well, then for the same reason, get the hell out of here." But of course Woodin didn't get out.

Couzens supported Roosevelt. But he did not shrink from opposing anything he thought wrong. When Morgenthau was appointed, he named Earle Bailie, of Seligman and Company, special adviser to the Treasury. Seligman and Company had just been exposed by Senator Hiram Johnson for their amazing South American financing. Couzens was shocked at this appointment. When it came before the Senate Banking Committee for confirmation, Couzens held it up and practically forced the resignation of Bailie as a condition to Morgenthau's confirmation.

Couzens, of course, is not a radical. He is worth perhaps forty millions. But like every other honest man he is bitterly opposed to the shameful abuses by which so many highly respectable racketeers have brought the system to the verge of ruin. And he has not feared to talk and vote as he thought. And so he stood like a rock behind the Pecora investigation of the banking racketeers of New York and Cleveland and Detroit and every other place.

Out in Detroit practically every banking institution was wrecked by the disgraceful promotions of as merry a band of bank bandits as ever wielded a fountain pen or rooked a client. But if you go to Detroit today and discuss that shameful chapter with her banking and security and other downtown business men they will tell you that it was Couzens, not the bankers, who was responsible for their woes.

Couzens had been a severe critic of the operations of the R.F.C. under Hoover. He had denounced secret loans to save large banks in many big cities in order to save the managers and directors from disgrace and, perhaps, jail. He was chairman of a subcommittee of the Banking Committee to confer with the R.F.C. about its policies. Shortly after this the Detroit bankers found themselves in a jam. They wanted a hundred million dollars from the R.F.C. to save them. Couzens, who had denounced the flooding of public money into other cities to save their bankers, had the courage to refuse to approve a loan to the Detroit bankers. Couzens' approval was not needed. But the R.F.C. was afraid to make the loan in such a bad situation unless its fearless critic could be silenced. The banks failed and the business groups' wrath fell upon Couzens rather than on the men who had robbed them and their customers.

Couzens is a brave man. But that was a tough spot and he shrank from taking an active part in running down the bankers. He welcomed, therefore, a presidential appointment on an economic mission to Europe. He was well out of the rotten mess. Then one day in London he bought a paper with large headlines announcing that Mrs. Couzens had been one of those who had pulled "hot money" out of one of the Detroit banks. Mrs. Couzens, a generous contributor to children's charities, had given a check for $5,000 to some Eastern movement. The check cleared just ahead of the crash. This was called "hot money."

But it was a foolish piece of meanness, because it set Couzens' soul afire. He returned to Detroit and began to dig into the very bottom of those closed banks. He hired halls and made speeches all over Detroit exposing the crookedness of the bankers.

The depth and fury of the execration with which he was greeted by Detroit business men cannot be described. One day he sat at a table in the Detroit Club. Fellow members at the table rose and took their plates to another table. But all of Couzens' charges were aired before the Senate Committee and proved to the hilt. Many of the men he denounced were indicted. What has become of those indictments I do not know.

Now Couzens has been defeated for renomination. Some of those bankers, of course, have been ruined forever. But others are climbing back. Detroit, then so prostrate, is returning to its rich profits again. It would like to forget its sins. It is actually beginning to feel righteous about itself. But it will have to answer to history for its treatment of the man who had the courage to stand for its people against their exploiters. In the end he paid for a fine act of frankness. In a Republican primary he said honestly that he was for Roosevelt. He might have perished in a better cause.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

Until the present administration came into power there was no doubt in the minds of our citizens as to the dependability of the security offered by our banks, insurance companies, and other depositories.—*Editorial by Bernarr Macfadden in Liberty.*

The only barriers today between our supposedly free land and the Reds are Japan, Italy and Germany and the Hearst papers in America.—*From a letter in The St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch.*

"We veterans regard ourselves as the number-one pacifists of the world because we are ready to fight, if necessary, to convince other nations that our demands for peace must be respected."—*James E. Van Zandt, national commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, quoted in an Associated Press article in The Buffalo Evening News.*

Dr. Anderson then attacked unionism for its "spirit of selfishness," which he said tended to stress unduly the material phases of work. "The trouble with unions today," he said, "is that they have become simply organizations to secure higher wages and shorter hours for their members."—*Report of a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Merle H. Anderson, of the North Presbyterian Church, New York City, in The New York Times.*

PEEK-A-BOO!

Suzanne Talbot, French designer: "I designed the 'skyscraper' hat, you know, so now I've come to see what the skyscrapers look like. Next season's gowns will reflect the international situation. Revolution is in the air everywhere, and fine gowns for fine ladies will be definitely inconspicuous—not to attract the attention of the proletariat, you see."—*Interview reported in The New York Herald Tribune.*

"WHA'D'YA WANT TO MAKE THOSE EYES AT ME FOR?"

"I am not a very religious man, but I have a religion now," Morton told his audience. "I got it about a year ago, when I first looked into the finest pair of eyes I have ever seen, the eyes of Alf Landon."—*Sterling Morton, chairman of the industrial division of the Republican National Committee, in an interview published in The Detroit News.*

CATCHING THEM COMING AND GOING

The first thing a munitions factory produces after it has been taken over by the Nazi government is 1,000 baby carriages. . . . The state commissioner in charge of the plant, which is equipped to produce other articles as well as munitions, called for 1,000 perambulators. These will be donated to households in which, in 1936, new babies burden hard-pressed family budgets.

Besides the 1,000 baby carriages the plant expects to produce a record quantity of army munitions.—*News item in the Philadelphia Ledger.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic.—THE EDITORS.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Letter from Paris

SIR: Last night I went to the meeting for Spain at the Velodrome d'Hiver. I've been to most of the public demonstrations which have been held in Paris since last April. None of them was like this. Such force and *élan* I have never seen before. They shout with one voice: "Airplanes for Spain!" One hundred thousand Parisians. Half of them had to be turned away at the door. There was nothing for them but to go away; the government had prohibited the placing of loud speakers in the street (the government of Léon Blum, mind you!). The preliminary speakers are hissed down. The people have had enough of pacific expressions of solidarity. They ask only one thing: Airplanes must be sent to Spain. If the people of Spain are fighting for liberty, against fascism, then they are fighting for the people of France.

La Passionaria rises to speak. The mass rises to its feet to sing "The International," as it has probably never been sung. It's impossible to describe this leader of the Spanish Communist Party. I can find nothing better to say than that she has the line, the flame, of El Greco, the terrifying power of Goya. But the figure is ridiculous and trivial when used for this woman. All Spain is here embodied in one person. Here you see what Spain can become if fascism is crushed. And it will be. There is an indomitable vitality and energy in the tall figure, the handkerchief moving like a banner ceaselessly, in the hands, agitated, against the black background of the dress. Her voice, a kind of rich contralto, pouring out the torrent of words, a flood beautiful and cadenced, beating like waves, regularly, and rising higher and higher, like a storm. And her face and hands sweeping the audience in their warm, generous wake. No one except the Spaniards understands the words, but it doesn't matter, the audience listens spellbound for three-quarters of an hour, rising to every gesture of the pantomime in perfect comprehension.

This afternoon there's to be another demonstration in the Place de la Republique. It was to have been in front of the Spanish embassy, but the government (Léon Blum's) ordered the *salopards* off to the other end of town.

To think, munitions ordered six months ago by the government of Spain are being held up in Bordeaux! Neutrality. And yet the reactionary press claims that the People's Front is daily sending huge shipments of arms to the governmental troops. That's all the pretext Hitler and Mussolini want. It would seem that such news is invented out of thin air simply to assure that Franco will continue to receive supplies from Italy and Germany. Bailby and Taittinger should be told that the leaders of fascism do not have to wait upon their suggestion to break the "neutrality pact."

Paris is excited at present over the latest idea of the Communist Party: to form a Front Français. This is intended to have a much wider base than the Front Populaire. The object is to unify the French people against the danger of revolution at home and the fascist menace abroad. If formed it will be a national party under the direction of the Communists. . . .

It seems to me to be a very sensible idea. No, it's not the communism of five years ago, or even of six months ago. It's simply an answer to Hitler by a return to the foreign policy of Barthou. The vague and ineffectual pacifism enunciated by Blum at the League is hopelessly out of place in present-day Europe. . . .

By the way, Roosevelt's peace-conference idea was greeted with considerable enthusiasm by the parties of the Front Populaire, with derision by everyone else.

R. W. WILEY.

Paris, France.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will Isolation Pay?

SIR: Your editorial "Publicity for Spanish Interventionists" in The New Republic of August 26 raises important questions.

1. If Italy and Germany have no intention of remaining neutral in any conflict—civil or international—between fascism and democracy, are nations with democratic forms of government helping the cause of peace by maintaining a policy of non-intervention?

2. By how much would the triumph of fascism in Europe increase the possibility of invasion of the United States? (Item: If Great Britain should be defeated in a general European war in which we took no part, would an attempt at colonization of Canada by a fascist country be probable?)

3. If there were no attempt at an invasion of the Americas, would the defeat of democracy in Europe make likely the triumph of fascism in the United States?

These questions seem to me to be as important as those discussed some time ago in your series of essays on neutrality. The anwers to them would help us decide whether or not the isolationists are leading us to an ivory tower.

Bell Buckle, Tenn. J. T. LYNN.

Praise for Miss Zugsmith

SIR: I feel personal gratitude to you for publishing Leane Zugsmith's powerful and exquisite story, "A Piece of Advice," in The New Republic of August 12.

Who am I to express an opinion on literature? Only one who always wanted to write like that but couldn't quite. I don't know anyone who does either unless it is John Dos Passos, and even he sees through a narrower lens, I believe; he would have seen the man's life shattering under the economic pressure of his job, but might not have seen the internal pressure of the man's own warring elements.

Roanoke, Va. IVA J. GEARY.

Save the Hudson River

SIR: One of the most beautiful historic sections of the Hudson River will be destroyed unless immediate action is taken to prevent the construction of the proposed Hudson River crossing between Nyack and Tarrytown on the famous Tappan Zee. That this site should have been chosen despite official opposition from villages, protest from steamship companies and strenuous objection on the part of individual home owners is, to put it charitably, incredibly stupid. It leaves the inference that there is something more sinister than stupidity behind the selection of this site.

Why should Colonel Frederick Stuart Green, Alexander Potter and Dr. Joseph Hughes be permitted to cram this unsightly, unwelcome and unneeded obstruction upon a community one-hundred-percent opposed? If a bridge were necessary and the commissioners were working in the public interest, they would not select the widest part of the Hudson—the Tappan Zee, three miles across, an inland sea—when north and south of the Tappan Zee there are several locations where the Hudson is only one mile wide, or less, offering easy access to main arteries east, west, north and south.

Apparently these would-be bridge builders are more imaginatively endowed than mathematically minded. Otherwise they would consider the taxpayers of Rockland and Westchester Counties and New York State. There is no heavy flow of traffic across the river from Tarrytown to Nyack. Of the three ferries that crossed the Tappan Zee two were closed because of lack of business. The remaining ferry company could carry four times as many cars as now cross the river. The commissioners assert that the proposed bridge would take at least 50 percent of the traffic now using the Bear Mountain Bridge. (This would ruin the Bear Mountain Bridge, which is already losing from $35,000 to $60,000 a year.)

In our growing and justified anxiety over the serious havoc caused by soil erosion and deforestation we should not relax our watch to preserve the beauties of this country, which are being as rapidly despoiled as our resources. Save the Hudson before it is too late.

ELMER S. HADER,
Zoning Administrator for the village of
Nyack, N. Y. Grand View-on-Hudson.

Union-Card Journalist

SIR: The International Executive Board of the American Newspaper Guild, meeting here in quarterly session, wishes to express its appreciation for Bruce Bliven's admirable article concerning the Guild in The New Republic of September 9.

HEYWOOD BROUN,
New York City. President.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

The Milk Consumers' Protective Committee of New York City sends us a copy of their letter to The New York Times in which they quote a recent study by the Consumers' Union to the effect that Grade B milk is practically as good as Grade A. Both are above the high city standard for Grade A; they have identical bacterial content, and Grade A is only slightly superior in butterfat and solid content. The main difference between them is that Grade A costs three cents a quart more. The Committee suggests that, since maximum consumption of milk is desirable for public health, it should be publicized that the cheapest milk obtainable in the city is that sold by grocers who purchase from small dealers. They add that the power of the two big distributors, Sheffield and Borden, is so great that consumers are facing a compulsory increase in price, and that protests should be sent to Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets Peter Ten Eyck, State Office Building, Albany, New York.

An open trial of the People versus Hearst has been announced by the People's Committee against Hearst, and will be held on Thursday, October 22, at the Hippodrome Theatre in New York City. Mr. Lee Simonson, of the Theatre Guild, will assist in staging the trial.

L. J. Salter, of North Rose, New York, is much amused by the current publicity given to a Harvard professor who believes that sun spots are the cause and explanation of the world's depressions. As a matter of fact, this theory has been put forward with a wealth of graphs, tables and scientific terminology in some of the weightiest and most learned journals in America and England. What puzzles Mr. Salter is this: If the recent years of depression have been caused by sun-spots, why is it that throughout this period the economic sun has been distinctly rising over one-sixth of the earth's surface, the Soviet Union?

Hamilton Basso's account of the convention at Asheville, in The New Republic for September 2, draws the comment from a correspondent that even though he would agree with Mr. Basso not to call the Reverend John LaFarge and Bishop Hafey fascists we must admit that the possibility of their becoming fascists is very good, and it would not be a strain on the imagination to brand them as such. Mr. Basso's reluctance to do so is laid to "the Southern tradition—a tradition that insists old ladies are nice and preachers reverent, and all God's children Democrats."

Sympathetic Americans have an opportunity to express their sentiments toward Spain through the newly organized Friends of the Spanish Republic, Inc., a non-partisan group with its temporary headquarters at the Hotel Claridge, Suite 216-17, New York City. Among the aims of this organization are to raise funds for the Spanish Red Cross, to spread the truth about the Spanish Republic and to refute the slanders of its enemies.

What's on the Air?

The Bishop of Durham, a leading fighter for academic freedom, particularly in connection with the expulsion of scholars from Germany, speaks from London on "Universities and Freedom." Sunday, September 27, at 2:45 P. M., C.B.S.

John B. Kennedy comments on the results of The Literary Digest's nationwide poll. Monday, September 28, 7:15 to 7:30 P. M., N.B.C.-WJZ.

Colonel Frank Knox, Republican candidate for Vice President, speaks Monday, September 28, from 7:30 to 8 P. M., N.B.C.-WJZ.

Norman Thomas speaks from San Francisco on "Unemployment." Thursday, October 1, 10:45 P. M., C.B.S.

Program of the Communist Party. Friday, October 2, 10:45 to 11 P. M., N.B.C.-WJZ.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ballads in Mississippi

II

AS WE have seen, the first two parts of Professor Hudson's book[1] deal with English and Scottish popular ballads and other imported ballads and songs to be found in Mississippi. The rest of the volume has not this connection with the British Isles. The subjects and origins here are part of the American story, and one way and another they scatter interest in many directions.

Among the songs of varied patterns we find "Young Charlotte" (three texts from Mississippi), written in Vermont over a hundred years ago by "William Carter, the Bensontown Homer" and known over the entire country; "Johnny Sands"; "Mister Boll Weevil"; "Silver Jack"; "Hard Times"; "Casey Jones"; "Calomel"; "Frankie" (in many texts available: "Frankie and Albert," "Frankie and Johnnie," etc.). The presence of so many Western ballads and cowboy songs in Mississippi is explained by the fact that long before 1850 great numbers of people moved from there to Texas and the West, a part of whom came home again after a time and settled down for life. Mississippians went to the Mexican War. And in the hard times after the War Between the States, some thousands of discouraged families and adventurous young men went West, hoping for braver fortunes. Out of some groups of these more than half returned. So that, as Professor Hudson says, "in their relation to the people of Mississippi these Western pieces may be thought of as a lyric gloss to the obscure and unchronicled odysseys of thousands of humble folk who went West and came back."

Among the earlier settlers there were many families who made the journey with a train of carriages, horses, wagons and Negroes, and built large houses, and sometimes a church, and renewed their old scale of living with the more lavish fortunes of this new, rich land. There were also the simpler people leaving their small farms and the hardening social conditions in the older Southern states, who were on the make in their new home. And there was yet a third type, coming in general somewhat later. These were the poor whites, the squatters, tillers of bad land in the past acquiring largely the poorer land now, piney-woods people, living on the outskirts, often squalidly, some by choice, many of them worthless, some drifting, some bettering themselves as time went on. The amount of mixing among these diverse grades of people was less than might be thought. Travelers of every sort noted the social divisions. But away from the planter sections—and here and there in them no doubt—the frontier life could be rough and breezy enough. Out of the abundant records of that life a passage from Reuben Davis' "Recollections of Mississippi and Mississippians" will do to top off with. "I have often laughed," he says, "at the recollection of a scene of which I was only a spectator that winter (1842-43) in Jackson. It was far on in the depth of the winter night when I was awakened by a confusion of sounds in the street, music predominating. I threw open a window, and beheld a long line of well dressed gentlemen proceeding in single file down the middle of the street and loudly singing the then popular melody of 'Buffalo Bill came down the meadow.' It was the legislature of Mississippi indulging in an airing, after having spent an evening in the worship of Bacchus. The chorus was given with a will, and the streets fairly resounded with the lively ditty."

Out of this lustier frontier life was coming meanwhile that whole galaxy of humorous realists, authentic and varied, from whom Mark Twain derives and without whom it might not be easy to imagine him at all. The aristocratic tradition confronted with the frontier is remarkably done in the Grangerford chapters of "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn." The variety of braggadocio formulas that Mark Twain was to make so famous can early be seen in this traveler's note (1808, Christian Schultz) from Natchez-under-the-Hill, a quarrel on the levee. "One said, 'I am a horse; I am a team. I can whip any man in all Kentucky, by G-d!' The other replied, 'I am an alligator; half man, half horse; can whip any man on the Mississippi, by G-d.' The first one again: 'I am a man; have the best horse, best gun, best dog, and handsomest wife in all Kentucky, by G-d!' The other: 'I am a Mississippi snapping-turtle, have bear's claws, alligator's teeth and the devil's tail; can whip any man, by G-d.' This was too much for the first, and at it they went like two bulls, and continued for half an hour, when the aligator was fairly vanquished by the horse."

On the edges of this life, in places like those dens below Natchez and under the Memphis bluffs, along highways like the Natchez Trace, and in the swamps and creek bottoms, flourished outlaw bands like Murrel's, the Harpes and others. The ballads of criminals, outlaws and vagrants that Professor Hudson prints could scarcely be unexpected: "Jack Donahoo"; "Sidney Allen"; "Charles Guiteau"; songs about hobos and railroad bums, or the six Mississippi variants of "Jesse James," admittedly the prince of American outlaw ballads. Two ballads are about a Mississippi "bad man" still alive in the state penitentiary: "Kenny Wagner" is one, and the other "Kenny Wagner's Surrender." These two ballads—there are said to be more in circulation—are known in several states and were popular songs as late as 1928.

From these bloody outlaw fields, and the Civil War songs, the full sections made up of Dialogue and Nursery Songs and songs used in singing games seem mild pastures indeed, what with "I'll Give to You a Paper of Pins" (if you will marry me, me, me); "The Frog Went A-Courtin' He Did Ride"; "Skip to My Lou" (Lost my partner, what'll I do? Can't get a red-bird, a black-bird'll do, Fly in the buttermilk, shoo fly shoo, etc.); and some thirty more.

There is one item in which Professor Hudson's method seems to me at fault. This is when he speaks of "dialectical words," "archaisms," "fossils of poetic folk speech" that persist among certain types of his Southern students. A better method would be to present such instances in the light of their source, usually some English shire or shires where they began and are often still in use.

The practice made by the University of North Carolina Press of spelling Southern with a small letter—southern—is inconsistent with South, and can be uselessly confusing.

STARK YOUNG.

[1] Folksongs of Mississippi and Their Background, by Arthur Palmer Hudson. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 333 pages. $5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The Shadow of Yesterday

We are living in a demented world. And we know it. It would not come as a surprise to anyone if tomorrow the madness gave way to a frenzy which would leave our poor Europe in a state of distracted stupor, with engines still turning and flags streaming in the breeze, but with the spirit gone.

WITH THESE words the distinguished rector of the University of Leyden opens his analysis of the contemporary crisis.[1] No one has a better right to utter these candid words than a sane, well poised humanist like Dr. Huizinga, best known in America, perhaps, as the author of "The Waning of the Middle Age." The first part of this pithily written book examines the nature of the present state of society, and distinguishes it from other periods of crisis in the past. Huizinga has no difficulty in showing that our culture is in a state of disequilibrium, that our superficial mass education, so far from enthroning reason, as the eighteenth century hoped, has only made larger collections of men a prey to irrational suggestion, and that there is a general decline of the critical spirit—a turning away from science and a recrudescence of superstition, quite as marked among the intellectuals as among the submissive millions.

On all these symptoms Huizinga has many just things to say. His ironic humanism is of quite another order than the wholesale vituperations of a Max Nordau almost two generations ago, or the more recent provincial blustering of a Spengler: he presents, on the whole, an equable exposure of the mental deterioration that has overtaken the modern world. Nevertheless, one follows Huizinga's argument with a growing sense of dissatisfaction: a dissatisfaction that grows out of the suspicion, which the last two chapters on "Prospects" and on "Catharsis" amply confirm, that all his values lie in the past, and that he has no sense of fresh emergents in modern society, and no confidence in their capacity to alter our present situation.

In the earlier part of his book, Huizinga points out that there can be no turning back: "thought and creative power must continue undaunted on the road which the mind compels them to follow." But unfortunately an undertow of class feeling does pull Huizinga backward, despite the clean, vigorous set of his intellect. After exposing the abysmal puerilities of the Nazis, he himself expresses a wistful sympathy with their naïve conception of fixed estates and natural ranks, a barbaric doctrine for which there is no foundation in contemporary science. Similarly, he turns back to the notion of a purified Christian church as a main instrument of our cultural salvation. The fact is that Huizinga does not trust the new sources of thought and creative power that are actually in existence: he either shrinks from embracing them or is unaware of their existence.

The fact is that Huisinga, in "In the Shadow of Tomorrow," does not live up to the challenge of his own opening chapter: he himself writes within the shadow of yesterday, and by preference and habit he tries to draw warmth from the setting sun while every minute the air grows chillier. How can a modern man, faced with many grave symptoms of collective madness, write about this dementia intelligently if he rejects the important clues with which a great line of brilliant psychologists, beginning with Freud, have provided us: where else indeed can he find an explanation of the illusions and hallucinations and sadisms and infantile regressions that characterize the fascists?

How, again, can a philosopher who understands the organic nature of culture, fail to show a special appreciation for the work of Marx, who, apart from the myths and dogmas associated with his name, has importance precisely because he reintroduced the conception of an organic relationship between body and spirit, between economics and culture—the lack of which drives Huizinga into a weak dualism? To speak about the deterioration of the modern mind without mentioning the chronic starvation and periodic disruption of our economic life, is to give the most partial of diagnoses. Unlike Leonard Woolf in "Quack, Quack!" Huizinga has little to say of the moral responsibility of the ruling classes for the present state of the world—their willingness to have the world perish rather than let justice be done.

Finally, it is strange to behold a citizen of Holland, the scene of some of the most virile work that has been done in modern architecture and community planning, dwelling on the collapse of style in the modern world with no apparent appreciation of the fact that his generalization applies only to the dead eclecticism of the nineteenth century. Huizinga, perhaps out of the same backward-turning mood which puts him out of touch with Marx and Freud, ignores the signs of integration that have become so numerous in architecture: a strong, comprehensive, organically related style, springing out of the more positive forces of modern society, its concern with health and education and a new social order: the new vernacular of the machine.

To fail to recognize these forces and ideas, or to misappraise them, is to present a distorted picture of the modern world and to give a belittling view of its creative powers. Yet the business of the philosopher, as Mencius said, is to recognize the future character of a thing when one beholds it in the germ: any idiot can recognize it when it is full-grown. And it is here that Huizinga, despite his many excellent and endearing qualities of mind, fails us. Lacking faith in the forces that are symbolized by Marx, Freud, Geddes and Wright, forces that work toward a new integration of personality and community, the thinker is bound to accept either the brutal, irrational, unifying processes of fascism, or some form of disruptive dualism, which treats body and spirit as separate entities and attempts to cure one without altering the condition of the other. Spengler chose the first path: the sentimentalism of blood and iron. Huizinga chooses the second. But "thought and creative power must continue undaunted" on a third path whose direction and destination are day by day becoming better defined: an organic community in which the means of living will be at the service of life.

The task of men of good will today is not to expose our weaknesses again: history, as we blunder through the days, has done that ruthlessly enough. The task of the philosopher is rather to fortify our virtues, by reaffirming the positive

[1] In the Shadow of Tomorrow, by Jan Huizinga. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 239 pages. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

values of objective thought and rational coöperation: he must be aware of fascism in order that he may help create the dialectic antithesis to its organized tyranny, its mechanized ferocity, its glorified servility. The potential energy of civilization is still much greater than that of barbarism: but it must be released, directed, put to work in the active transformation of the social order. He who stops at a shorter goal is, despite himself, on the side of barbarism.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

Orestes in Alabama

The Long Night, by Andrew Lytle. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. $2.50.

THIS NOVEL by Andrew Lytle, author of "Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company," will probably rank with Mr. John Peale Bishop's "Act of Darkness" as the best fictional performance of the Southern Agrarians. It is, however, more strictly in the Agrarian tradition than was Mr. Bishop's novel: deriving its importance, not so much from the story it has to tell, as from its reconstruction of a vanished way of life whose essence, if not actuality, the Agrarians seek to recapture.

We have had many such reconstructions: in prose and in poetry. An examination of this Agrarian literature shows that each member of the group, while paying tribute to the Good Life of the 50's, has created his own special kind of past. There has developed, because of this, a division in the Agrarian ranks that has been consistently overlooked. While it is true that a haze of nostalgic romanticism tends to obscure and soft-lens the Agrarian landscape, there are realistic Agrarians as well as romantic ones.

Mr. Lytle, in his biography of Forrest, revealed very clearly that he has no fondly cherished illusions about the past. In this book he again abjures the stylized conventions of the aristocratic tradition. There are no soft-voiced ladies flirting behind scented fans: no dashing gallants; no plantation choruses crooning spirituals beneath a yellow moon. Mr. Lytle, in fiction, says what the tables and indices of Mr. Howard Odum's very fine "Southern Regions" implied in fact: that the culture of the Old South—Tom Page and everybody else to the contrary—was the culture of the frontier. For most people, including members of the upper classes, life was hard, even brutal. Illiteracy was more prevalent than learning. Men took their whiskey and insults hard. The most respected authority was the authority of the gun. All this Mr. Lytle makes very clear: and there is one scene in his book, in which a crowd of half-drunken men bathe and dress a corpse, that is going to make Mr. Page's spirit very restless indeed.

The story in "The Long Night" is a story of vengeance. Vengeance is a dark theme: it comes out of what Balzac called the night of the soul, and already "The Long Night" has been called Dostoevskian. If all the books that have been called Dostoevskian in the past three years were laid end to end they would reach from here to God knows where, maybe the heart of Russia, and Mr. Lytle's book deserves more substantial praise than that. The emotion in this book is not terror, there is nothing Dostoevskian about it, it is simply a very good story about a man who sets out to avenge the murder of his father, and the One! Two! Three! way the murderers fall is more like "The Count of Monte Cristo" than anything else: except, along with the Dumas interest, you get a very well done picture of life in the American South around 1860. And that is a lot to get in one book.

HAMILTON BASSO.

Was Harvard Worth While?

Was College Worth While? by John R. Tunis. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 246 pages. $2.

I MAY as well confess at once that it is quite impossible for me to review John Tunis' very able excoriation of the Harvard Class of 1911 with the Olympian detachment and calm normally expected of the reviewer: and this for the simple reason that I'm a member of that unhappy class myself. And John doesn't leave very much of us. By the time he has finished the somewhat garish job of giving a sort of daylight-section of our pitiful little ant's nest, we look like the saddest assemblage of stupid and self-satisfied mediocrities it was possible to graduate from a university—unless, as John is charitable enough to hint, Yale and Princeton were, in those days, even worse. It seems that we haven't been a success at anything whatever. Despite the inestimable advantages of a college education, a lot of us are practically in the poorhouse, tramps and telephone operators and garage mechanics are amongst our number, and 47 percent of those of us who are married have put our wives to work. Of the 541 members of the class who dutifully sent in reports, the average yearly earnings, in 1934, were $4,450—a sum which John Tunis seems to think small enough to be a reflection on the class, but which to an author looks very large indeed. Further, only 13 percent of us had ever gone in for public service, in the form of civic or political work, and only 2.5 percent actually into government service; only 23 of us have been canonized by "Who's Who"; we have contributed, so our cruel analyst informs us, nothing in the way of leadership, moral or political or economic—which perhaps isn't so surprising, when it's remembered that 75 percent of us are Republicans; and, finally, there is only one lone member of the class who admits that he likes to read poetry. (I don't know whether we ought to count the college professor who says he learned to play the saxophone—"God knows why!")

Well, it's pretty awful, and it seems to be made worse by the fact that this collection of failures actually seems to *like* being failures. They actually *like* just coasting along on barely enough to live on, enjoying their apple trees and sailboats and kids, their home-made philosophies and a handful of solid books. They seem to say—as conservatives and Tories and Chinese philosophers have been saying since the beginning of things—"You fellows who *want* to run things, go ahead and run them: only leave us alone." And why not, in Heaven's name? We can't all be intellectuals or artists or go-getters or political evangels: one in twenty of us is in "Who's Who," which is more than a telephone directory would average: and there's a great deal to be said, in a world that appears to be torn to pieces by energetic people with terrific convictions, for not being too convinced or too certain about anything. In short, it all comes down to the question of what we go to college *for*. And it's pretty obvious that this group of good-natured tories went for, and got, something pretty good. As "education," in the strict or academic sense of the word, it was poorish, if only because we were the victims of the tag-end of the elective system—it was too easy to get the equivalent of a "pass" degree, and by adroitly avoiding subjects for which we had no taste or aptitude we tended to become one-sided. One-sided, but not specialized. We took it easy, got a smattering of delightful things in a delightful lazy way—even now we're pretty weak on spelling—but we became philosophers. And in a world too much committed to action we submit that a little quietism might be a good thing.

CONRAD AIKEN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Understanding Karl Marx: A Debate

1: Deforming Marx

From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx, by Sidney Hook. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 335 pages. $4.

ABOUT six years ago my attention was called to a debate on the ideas of Karl Marx, then going on in The Modern Quarterly between Max Eastman and Sidney Hook. The debate did not much interest me at the time; it appeared to me a novices' affair; but two definite impressions have remained with me. One is that both debaters based their arguments almost exclusively on the early writings of Marx, dating from before 1847, that is to say, before Marx had definitively formulated, let alone elaborated, any of the great theories in sociology and economics that are associated with his name. The other is, in substance, that Eastman charged Marx with being a metaphysician, a theologian, and generally speaking, considering Marx's great practical purpose, a good deal of a fool, while Hook replied: That's impossible; why, Marx thinks exactly like John Dewey and me.

In his book "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx," published in 1933, Hook dealt with the specific Marxian theories. But that old notion of his in the debate with Eastman, that the ideas of Marx conform to those of Hook, persists throughout the book. Such being the case, it follows that Hook knows better the nature and purpose of "Das Kapital" than Frederick Engels ever knew; that Marx did not regard economics as a science (this is proved by giving the second half of a sentence from Marx); that the mode of production is the decisive factor in social life only because of "the revolutionary will of the proletariat which is prepared to act upon that assumption," so that in all past history, before the birth of the proletariat and its revolutionary will, and likewise before the birth of the "assumption," there was no economic determinism. Indeed, we are explicitly assured that in a collectivist society there will be no economic determinism. It follows further from the certainty—not the assumption—that Marx conforms to Hook, that "the truth of the theories of historical materialism and surplus-value presuppose, therefore, the existence of the class struggle"; so that, speaking generally, class struggles do not arise out of a given economic organization of society, but exist prior to that organization and give rise to that organization; and specifically, it is not the appropriation of surplus-value that gives rise to strikes, but it is strikes that give rise to surplus-value.

Since Hook is convinced that Marx thinks just like Hook, there is obviously no need for Hook to study Marx. All Hook needs to do is to project his own ideas and tack them on to Marx. Thus we are informed that "capital is wealth used for the production of more commodities," in the name of Marx. We are told that Marx's analysis of the commodity was "an attempt to discover the tendencies of capitalist production"—and not of simple commodity production, which antedates capitalism. Labor-power and labor are invariably confused, whereas in Marx they are as distinct as the concepts of potential and kinetic energy in mechanics. The determination of value by labor is confused with the determination of value by the wages paid to labor; the latter conception Marx expressly repudiates. We are informed that " the historical record shows that a change from one social order to another has always been achieved by class struggle and in no other way"—a magnificent generalization if true. But it is not true. "The historical record" is a figure of speech, a private secret of Hook's. I have yet to learn that slavery was supplanted by serfdom, the Roman imperial organization by feudalism, paganism and ancient philosophy by Christianity, through class struggle. And Hook, it would seem, has yet to learn that economic determinism is a far more inclusive theory than that of the class struggle, that the latter is only a special modification of the former.

In "From Hegel to Marx" Hook goes back, in the main, to the early writings of Marx, which he expounds in conjunction with, and opposition to, the writings of Hegel and the Young Hegelians: Strauss, Bauer, Ruge, Stirner, Hess and Feuerbach. The last named, in particular, exercised a profound influence on young Marx and helped him greatly, both positively and negatively, in effecting the transition from philosophy to science. The period of transition lasted between four and five years. In 1842, when Marx was twenty-four and became the editor of the Rheinische Zeitung, he knew nothing of economics or communism. But five years later he shows himself, in the "Anti-Proudhon" and the "Communist Manifesto," a master economist of the Ricardian school and a revolutionizer of historical science, besides being the founder of a new party of revolution that was destined to overshadow or absorb all the old schools and parties. The principal phases of this marvelously rapid intellectual growth are, of course, to be found in these early writings.

As the product of a transitional period in Marx's intellectual life, they are not all of equal value, nor is any of them of the same value throughout. Alongside passages of profound insight into the past and future of mankind and passages of tremendous satiric force, there are other passages that brim over with the froth of young genius eager to test its strength, exuberant in the manifestation of its power. They are not all pure gold, nor are they to be taken as the theorems in "Das Kapital" are taken, one and all or not at all, because the omission of one link would break the entire chain. A critic endowed with historical sense, literary taste and an understanding of Marxism could distil out of them the essential and permanently valuable, and could trace the successive steps in Marx's transformation from a philosophical rebel into the towering man of science whose very name affects people like a battle flag. Hook's book does not show the necessary qualifications; it is an arid, dreary waste; to plod through it is a veritable martyrdom. One has only to read the chapters on the Young Hegelians and on Marx's early writings in Franz Mehring's "History of German Social Democracy," or the same author's introductions in his famous edition of the early writings of Marx and Engels, to see the difference between the work of a great historian and critic, who was also a master of philosophic literature, and dry-as-dust, scholastic pedantry.

In this book, too, Hook follows his peculiar method of imputing to Marx the ideas of Hook. He says, to give one example among several: "Fundamental social antagonisms . . . grow out of the whole social process whose secret is to be sought in the relationships which those *who consume goods* bear to those who control production and distribution." The loose, confused thinking that pervades

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these two books is well illustrated in this sentence. If I speak of the *whole* social process, I include of course the social antagonisms, the superficial as well as the fundamental; with Hook, the *whole* social process *produces* the social antagonisms, which is like saying that the whole produces its component parts. Whenever Marx and Engels speak of the determining economic factor, they mention the mode of production, or more explicitly, production and *exchange;* but Hook, who invariably improves on them, speaks of production and *distribution,* which in every elementary textbook is totally distinct from exchange. But leaving aside these confusions, since when does Marxism trace fundamental social antagonisms to the relations between producers, or controllers of production, and consumers? Hook refers the reader to the third volume of "Das Kapital" in the original German. Can anything look more convincing and more learned? But I am a hardened skeptic. I look it up, and here is what Marx says: "It is always the immediate relation of the owners of the conditions of production to the immediate producers . . . in which we find the innermost secret, the hidden foundation of the entire social structure, and hence also of the political form of the sovereignty-subjection relationship, in short, of the specific state-form at any time and place." Do you see the resemblance? Can you discover the consumers?

In this book, as well as in his earlier one, Hook is continually harping on Marx's "purpose." I cannot fathom Hook's purpose in always recurring to Marx's purpose. But the implication is unavoidable that because Marx had a revolutionary purpose, therefore his conclusions are suspect, or at least biased. To this I can only reply that every scientist proceeds in his work with a purpose, theoretical or practical. His problems are given him by the state of knowledge or the state of industry. He has one or several hypotheses. He tests them. He accepts, or modifies, or rejects them. But in the course of his tests he may stumble upon problems and truths of which he had not even dreamed before. Precisely so with Marx. He was only twenty-five when he reached the formidable conclusion that only the proletariat was capable of revolutionizing society. With this idea in mind, his attention was attracted to phenomena that the "regular" historians and economists had overlooked or neglected. Thus he came to formulate the materialist conception of history. (For the theory of the class struggle, Marx himself modestly claimed the paternity of Augustine Thierry, the French historian, though Marx immensely extended its application.) And when he settled down to an independent investigation of the economics of capitalism, during the period of enforced inactivity that followed the defeat of the revolution of 1848, he stumbled upon problems and discovered relations of which neither he nor the great classical economists had previously had any conception. To be sure, it takes genius to "stumble" in this way, to be confronted with problems where others saw solutions, and to discover solutions where others found themselves in a maze of contradictions. But given the genius, this is the way it works. By its own inherent processes, the processes inherent in thought, it arrives at conclusions that are entirely independent of its original purpose or starting point. Saul went in search of his father's asses, and found a kingdom.

HERMAN SIMPSON.

We submitted Mr. Simpson's review to Sidney Hook, whose reply appears in the next column.

A short rebuttal by Mr. Simpson and a rejoinder by Mr. Hook will be printed soon in our correspondence columns.—THE EDITORS.

2: Marxism as a Living Philosophy

SINCE the reader will find it difficult to tell, on the basis of Mr. Simpson's review, what the ideas are that I am presumably reading into Marx, I have no choice but to state them. They can then be easily controlled by anyone who goes directly to Marx's works.

In "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx" I maintained that a unity of method and purpose informs the whole of Marx's writings. Defining Marxism as the theory and practice of social revolution, I tried to prove that it is not an abstract, deductive system of social science or economics but a social philosophy based on (1) a scientific analysis of the tendencies of capitalist production, (2) an acceptance of the values and ideals implicit in the revolutionary struggles of the working class, and (3) a recognition of the role of *human activity,* conditioned as it is by past tradition and present social relations, in changing the environment. In this way I sought to clarify some outstanding problems in Marxist literature: *e.g.,* how Marx can combine social determinism with a belief in the practical effects of theory, especially his own, from which follows the existence of open, even if limited, alternatives of action; why Marx is interested in explaining not variations in market price but the nature of capitalist accumulation; why every Marxist must be a socialist, which could not be the case if Marxism were nothing but an ethically neutral science; the admitted importance of great men (Marx, Lenin) in redetermining at crucial moments phases of history; the influence of chance, cultural lag and interaction in social affairs.

An important implication of the foregoing is that Marx's doctrines must be taken within the framework of class society and the practical objectives of the international working-class movement, not as truths valid for all time and place. Under socialism, economic life, history, law, art are still determined but not by the same uncontrolled factors that operate blindly in class societies. Marx repeats again and again that all laws and categories are essentially historical. This applies to his own discoveries.

In the course of my exposition I proposed the hypothesis that the apparent inconsistencies in Marx's writings, of which critics have made so much, can be explained as varying emphases arising as a result of criticism of opponents whose positions were antithetical to each other. Marx's purpose has been stressed, not to discredit his conclusions, but to illumine his meaning, the selection of his problems and the way he accents his ideas at different times. In "From Hegel to Marx" partial evidence is offered in behalf of this hypothesis for the period in which Marx developed his philosophy of dialectic or scientific materialism. Not sharing the naïve view that Marx "stumbled" upon his problems and truths, I describe the intellectual and social climate of his times, give an account of the people with and against whom Marx hammered out his own position and analyze the structure of the arguments involved. I have taken pains to expound the doctrines of the Young Hegelians, without a knowledge of which not even the language of Marx's "Heilige Familie" and "Deutsche Ideologie" can be understood.

Mr. Simpson's pebble throwing can hardly be considered an evaluation of the views I have put forward. Of the things he says, some are clearly hasty and invalid inferences from statements of mine given by him in disjointed phrases pinched from here and there. For example, where I assert that logically, under capitalism, the truth of the theories of historical materialism and surplus-value presupposes the existence of the class struggle, Simpson sees in this an im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plication that the latter is historically prior to the former, a glaring non-sequitur: where I use Marx's purpose as a key to his meaning, Simpson writes as if I were talking of Marx's personal motives. Other points he makes will not stand up for a moment if compared with what I have actually written. For example, I am charged with invariably (no less) confusing labor and labor-power, whereas in fact I show that this distinction is all-important for Marx's theory of wages and profit; the allegation that I confuse the determination of value by labor with the determination of value by wages paid to labor is simply false, for the whole point of the exposition of surplus-value is to show that it arises from values produced for which the worker receives no wages. That the analysis of the commodity is necessary to understand the tendencies of capitalist production follows from the explicit assertion of Marx and Engels both, that the value form of the commodity contains in embryo the whole capitalist form of production, including crises. While it may not be true that all change from one social system to another has been achieved by class struggles, Simpson's illustrations do not disprove it in the least. But the question here is: is this Marx's view or some more Dewey contraband? Can it be that Mr. Simpson is unaware of the fact that neither Dewey nor I is the author of the proposition: "All history is the history of class struggles"?

Throughout my entire discussion of Marx's *economics* I have made it clear that the basic antagonism is to be found between the social means of production and capitalist appropriation, and that all other antagonisms in the *economic* sphere are subordinate to it. Simpson ignores this. Instead he quotes a sentence from a paragraph devoted to a contrast between the Hegelian and the Marxian theories of the *state,* and by italicizing a phrase about consumers, without indicating that it is *his* italics, tries to give an impression that I am fathering a kind of consumption theory upon Marx. But the supporting reference which Simpson cites amply justifies the contrast I draw between Hegel's metaphysical and Marx's empirical theories of the *state.* I reproduce the whole paragraph below so that the reader can see for himself the context of both the quoted sentence and its supporting reference.

> The difference between the empirical and the metaphysical approach to politics is best revealed in the opposing definitions Hegel and Marx give of the state, and in the contrary functions they assign to it in relation to society. For Hegel the state is the realization of moral principles and concrete freedom. It is logically primary to society, the condition of all social life. For Marx the state is the product of social life, not its condition. It is an historic outgrowth of society. There are societies without states. The first must therefore be logically and historically prior to the state. Society is an organism in which the state functions as a principle of "organization." It arises, however, only when the organic nature of society threatens to be disrupted by social antagonisms. It functions as an instrumental agency in preserving those antagonisms and yet preventing social disruption. Fundamental social antagonisms ultimately express themselves in conflicting class interests and struggles. They grow out of the whole social process whose secret is to be sought in the relationships which those who consume goods bear to those who control production and distribution. Not only is the state far from being a *Stellvertreter* of absolute reason in affairs political, it is not even an umpire in the class tug-of-war. It is one of the means by which that war is fought. It does not come to bring reconciliation between classes but to reconcile subject classes to their lot. In the "Manifesto," Marx declares that "the modern state power is merely a committee which manages the common business of the bourgeoisie."

The real issue between Simpson and me reduces to the question whether Marxism is a closed deductive system of economics whose laws explain all culture, root, branch and flower, doom capitalism to inevitable collapse and guarantee the victory of socialism; or whether Marxism is a social philosophy grounded upon knowledge of economic tendencies *relevant* to its political aims, dedicated to the ideal of a good society "in which the free development of each individual is the condition for the free development of all," and guided by a theory of knowledge and history according to which, "men produce circumstances as much as circumstances men" (Marx). The first view has always been combined with a waiting upon events, a reliance upon forces not ourselves which give meaning to history and victory to those who believe, and pendular swings from sectarianism to opportunism. It contributed to the radical debacle in 1914 and to every major catastrophe of the working class since then. The Russian Revolution was not made in its name. Those who hold it may call themselves Marxists. But it was of them that Marx himself wrote: "I have sowed dragon's teeth and reaped fleas."

SIDNEY HOOK.

Parable of Youth

The Moon's No Fool, by T. S. Matthews. New York: Random House. $2.

MR. MATTHEWS has built a fantasy out of the entangling alliances of youth: his young hero becomes so confused and upset by leading a life for which he is unfitted that it requires a few hours of violent hallucination to straighten him out. In this sense Mr. Matthews' fantasy might be regarded as a fairy tale in which the hero must kill the dragon of false values in order to win the beautiful maiden of self-knowledge. Ben, when still a boy, was taken into the world of frivolous and irresponsible high society where he neither felt at home nor made his mark, but where, with the anxiety of the very young, he tried dismally to shine. He thought he wanted to be like Leo, the natural-born worldling; and when he was overtaken by mad dreams, it was Leo's identity he stole, only to emerge from his nightmare as much cured of being Leo as of accepting Leo's values.

As a fanciful yet simple way of exposing the tragicomedy of adolescence, "The Moon's No Fool" is thoroughly successful. It catches, however fitfully and impersonally, something of the essence of all the Felix Fays, the Amory Blaines, the Willie Baxters, the Philip Careys of yesterday; it is a parable of self-conscious and self-centered youth. Parable is exactly the word for it; nowhere can it be regarded as realism. Ben's life prior to his siege of nightmare is only a little less fantastic than the nightmare itself, for Mr. Matthews has stylized the whole story into something droll, whimsical and tea-tabley English. With a few strokes of the pen, you could easily accept Gerald Bullett as its author; there is the same bookish flavor, the same rather trivial grace. As fantasy, "The Moon's No Fool" does not so much create an illusion as maintain a tone; and the tone, if attractive, is also somewhat harmful. For we relish the author's cleverness, his neat style, his soap-bubble satire too lightly to bother about

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inquiring into the significance of what he is trying to say. It is perhaps a mistake, in the case of a story like this, for the author to have it so well under control; it comes to seem dainty, and at length artificial.

Much the more vivid portion of the book is that describing Ben's hallucination: there Mr. Matthews sometimes takes the halter off his imagination, sometimes plunges cleanly into satire, and replaces his mock-genteel atmosphere with something more animated and robust. But even there he skirts his social and economic issues too nimbly, remaining superficial; even there, though the distortion of life is genuine, we are conscious that the life distorted is faint and moonlit and prim. The fairy-tale note persists to the end, for it is only in fairy tales that you slay the dragon, win the beautiful maiden, and call it a day. Ben, having purged and probed himself, fades out inhabiting a world free from all further misfortunes rather than a world which may be supposed to dirty and dismay him all over again. LOUIS KRONENBERGER.

Books in Brief

Greengates, by R. C. Sherriff. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. $2.50.

THERE is no doubt that both the English and American publics love to read books about elderly men with hearts of gold, particularly if the number of carats increases as the book goes on. Priestley gave us the Northcountryman in "The Good Companions," James Hilton supplied Mr. Chips, and now Mr. Sherriff has given us Mr. Baldwin and his wife. Mr. Baldwin has retired from professional life and is trying to settle down in his melancholy home in the London suburbs, where he is without children, relatives, friends. The story describes how he and his wife succeed in dragging themselves away and settling on a Garden Estate in a fresh, modern house furnished from top to bottom with up-to-date furniture, steam heat and hot and cold running water. So far a story with an excellent moral. But when we finally leave Mr. Baldwin he is busy recreating as fast as he can all those bogeys he left behind in his old house. He has grown a nice high hedge to shut off the other houses, has succeeded in squashing a bumptious little upstart who actually tried to form a local club that "anyone" might join, and he has found a retired major to lecture on "Cricket in Trinidad." He is an active worker in a circle as exclusive as its members can make it. This book is not intended to be a satire on English life, but as such it should certainly be read. The writing is very good and Mr. Baldwin is the England of Priestley and Hilton, so possibly this book will sell like hot Chips. R. V.

The Old Man's Coming, by Gösta Gustaf-Janson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.75.

Like so many of the recent Scandinavian and Icelandic novels, this book stresses very strongly the influence of the Nazis upon the Northern countries of Europe. We can see through the author's eyes what a superb grazing-ground Scandinavia, with the Vikings and Norse heroes, makes for cattle who demand only the purest fodder that has no foreign and Oriental taint. But feeling that Nazism is but one of the consequences of fear and egoism, the author presents us with a range of characters who all suffer from extreme egoism but express it in their various individual ways. All these people—and a messy, obnoxious collection they are—we find collected in a Swedish manor house and the destiny of all of them is linked with a mysterious old man, owner of the house but lost from Sweden for twenty years. At some time or other most of them have done their best to ruin him and have dragged his name in the mud so successfully that his rapacity and awfulness have become a village legend and mothers threaten naughty children with "the old man." Half way through the book he announces his return and the remainder of the novel is devoted to a growing and realistic tension as the money-grubbers sit around waiting to hear his step and planning how they will dupe him. Until the last few pages have been reached the reader cannot determine whether the Old Man will really appear or not—but it is enough to say that the author has written an exciting, rapid story; that he demands individual humanism instead of Nazism or communism, and makes his demand very well indeed, assisted by a most capable translator. R.V.

They Seldom Speak, by Leland Hall. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

This novel is concerned with the recurrent pattern of character and situation in two generations of New England country people, the Harts. The uneventful story, told simply, directly, without embellishment, is pleasant enough to read and, in the persons of Ad Hart and his wife Carrie, the author achieves strength of characterization. However, in more neurotic types such as the school teacher, Miss Chatham, he seems to be without penetration, although this may be the fault of his entirely objective method. The method has its compensation in the fact that the book has more plain truth in it than do most recent New England novels which have found their way to the best-seller lists because of their strained "robustness" on the one hand or their wash of sentiment and easy optimism on the other. But it remains true that the objectivity of "They Seldom Speak" is devoid of implication or depth. M. S.

WPA FEDERAL THEATRE
Evenings Only
Tickets at Box Office or 701 - 8th Ave.
25¢ to 55¢
NO HIGHER
MEd. 3-5962

"HELP YOURSELF" ADELPHI Popular Price Thea. 54 E. of 7th Ave. CI. 7-7582
"INJUNCTION GRANTED!" LIVING NEWSPAPER BILTMORE THEATRE 47th Street & 8th Ave. • Evgs. 8:45 • Phone BRyant 9-4692
CHILDREN'S THEATRE "THE EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES" Majestic (Brooklyn) Fulton-Rockwell Pl.: Tel NEv 8-2720 MATS. ONLY Wed., Thurs., Fri., 2:30 P.M. 15-25-35c
Katayev's 3 Act Comedy "The Path of Flowers" DALY'S Theatre (Experimental) 63rd St. East of B'way. Every Evening 8:40 Phone: Circle 7-5852
Beg. Thurs. Eve. "89!" Pres. A Farce Comedy "Horse Eats Hat" MAXINE ELLIOT Theatre 39th St. East of Broadway Evenings at 8:40 Phone: CH 4-5715

THE THEATRE GUILD presents
IDIOT'S DELIGHT
a new play by Robert E. Sherwood with
ALFRED LUNT
LYNN FONTANNE
SHUBERT THEA., 44 St. W. of B'way. 300 seats $1 Mats.: Thurs. & Sat. 2:45. Eves. 8:45

AN EXTRAORDINARY JOINT RECITAL!
HALL JOHNSON NEGRO CHOIR
AND
MARTHA GRAHAM
FRIDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 2nd at 8:30
CARNEGIE HALL — Prices: $1, $1.65, $2.20, $2.75

WORKERS SCHOOL
35 East 12th Street Tel.: ALgonquin 4-1199
FALL TERM REGISTRATION
COURSES IN:
Political Economy
Marxism-Leninism
Trade-Union Problems
Dialectical Materialism
History
Finance Capital in U. S.
Fascist Trends and Tendencies in the U. S.
The Social History of the Negro People in the U. S
Science
Literature, and many others
Descriptive Catalogue Obtainable Upon Request—Day courses offered

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Artifex: Sketches and Ideas, by Richard Aldington. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 256 pages. $2.50.

Mr. Aldington is against religion and science. He is also pretty much against "civilization." In several of these sketches he writes against war, and writes well; but also he is against the disciplines that aim to prevent war. Collectivism he associates with—ant hills. He is for primitive man, for flowers and trees. One of the longer pieces is about D. H. Lawrence, whose disciple, needless to say, Mr. Aldington is. Lawrence's playful manner he reproduces with a mechanical competence, but the spontaneity and freshness of Lawrence somehow evade him. In the sketches of the people, between the deadliness of the characters and the author's rather brutal attitude towards them, the reader has an almost painful time of it. "The Partridge" is an entertaining exception. But one gets the impression that brutality, like the other false notes that abound in this volume—the pompousness, the forced charm, etc.—is not inherent in Mr. Aldington's character as a writer, but only in his uneasy and futile attitudes. F. D.

The Mountain and the Tree, by Helen Beauclerk. New York: Coward-McCann. $2.50.

Because Miss Beauclerk has started out with two themes, an infinite number of approaches and no point of view, the whole of her ambitious novel seems smaller than the sum of its parts. "The Mountain and the Tree" is written as an imaginative history of the fall of woman from her sacred prehistoric role of the omnipotent Mother to her ignoble status among the early Christians as a necessary evil. It is written as a sensational study of early religious cults and their believers, and it is written as four separate stories covering four periods of history: the prehistoric stone age in Crete, the coming of the Achæans in Greece, 1400 B.C., the cult of Orphism in Greece and the third century A.D. in Asia Minor. With the exception of the first story, which describes the havoc wrought in a matriarchal community on the discovery that the generative power rests in man, Miss Beauclerk's book is lost in a confusion of religious and erotic symbolism, drawn largely from "The Golden Bough." You can't see the mountains for the trees. M. F.

Contributors

HAAKON M. CHEVALIER, the author of "The Ironic Temper: Anatole France and His Time" and the translator of Malraux, teaches at the University of California.

EVELYN SEELEY, a former member of the staff of The New York World-Telegram, for which she covered the San Francisco general strike, is now teaching a "back-of-the news" course at Sarah Lawrence College.

ERNEST SEEMAN was the manager of the Duke University Press from its inception until his retirement after ten years of service.

LEWIS MUMFORD is familiar to readers of The New Republic for his many books and articles on art, literature and the social sciences.

HAMILTON BASSO's new novel, "Courthouse Square," will be published by Scribner's this fall.

CONRAD AIKEN, poet and novelist, is in our modest opinion the most distinguished member of Harvard '11, the class described in Mr. Tunis' book.

HERMAN SIMPSON was formerly an editor of the Socialist daily, The New York Call, and has been for many years a student of Marxist theory.

SIDNEY HOOK, the author of "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx" and "From Hegel to Marx," is chairman of the Department of Philosophy, Washington Square College, New York University.

LOUIS KRONENBERGER has contributed critical articles and reviews to many literary publications. He is the editor of "An Anthology of Light Verse," which is now one of the titles in the Modern Library, and "An Eighteenth Century Miscellany," recently published by G. P. Putnam.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Richard Vaughan, Mark Schorer, Frederick Dupee and Margaret Froehnknecht.

The School of APPLIED PHILOSOPHY

M. Benzenberg Mayer, Director

A new type of school, which balances intellectual pursuits with deeper and richer spiritual experience.

Man must come to know truth through the development of his own faculties, as Professor Gilson pointed out in one of the most significant addresses at the Harvard Tercentenary. At the School is used a technique, scientific and tested over many years, toward achieving this great objective.

Departments of Study, Research, Training. Day and evening classes now forming. 118 E. 76th St., N. Y. RH. 4-6267.

ANNOUNCING AN EXTRAORDINARY SALE OF

100,000 PARLOPHONE, Odeon, Decca discs. These marvelous European recordings comprise the cream of the world's finest music. A selection to gratify every taste. Sale prices: 50c & 75c per record. Values $1.50 & $2.00. Mail orders. Catalog.

GRAMOPHONE SHOP, Inc., 18 E. 48th St., N. Y.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUBS

A UNIQUE CLUB for unusual women and men. Books loaned free. Send 3c stamp. **CONTACTS, Box 91 Sta. D., New York City.**

The RIGHT introduction, thro our Friendship Club, may change the whole aspect of your life. Box 670, Seattle, Washington. Enclose postage.

HELP WANTED

WANTED—Volunteer assistants to work with young children at The Walden School with opportunity to receive teacher training. If interested telephone for interview, Sc. 4-1208.

POLITICAL

20 YEARS AFTER!

(Were you seduced by Mr. Wilson's fair words in 1916?)

Vote for NORMAN THOMAS

KINDERGARTEN

SOUND PROGRESSIVE SCHOOL

2-6 YEARS

Modern method of instruction, individual attention, mental hygiene, competent instructors, attractive outdoor premises, children called for and taken home.

LITTLE FOLKS KINDERGARTEN

661 West End Avenue RI. 9-4551

New York City

Also Special Boys' Club, 6-10 Yrs.

Outdoor Activities

Adele E. Bluver, Director

DRAMA :-: DANCE :-: MUSIC

FILM REVIVALS

30 Evenings $7.50

Starting October 18

Personal appearances by

Walter Hampden, Yale Puppeteers, Ballet Caravan, Esther Junger, Cornelia Otis Skinner, Harold Bauer, Martha Graham, Victor Chenkin, Benno Rabinof, Anna Sokolow, Negro Dance, Benjamin Zemach, Doris Humphry, Charles Weidman, & their groups.

Y.M.H.A., 92d St. & Lex. Ave., AT 9-2400

BOOKSHOP

For Bronx Readers

At

PEOPLE'S BOOK SHOP

2067 JEROME AVENUE

(Near Burnside Avenue)

For Liberals and Radicals of All Shades

We Specialize in the Works of

MARX VEBLEN FREUD

DEWEY and BEARD

All Books at Lowest Prices

BEN RUBIN, Manager

SUBLET FURNISHED

COLUMBIA PROFESSOR'S apartment; Riverside Drive, near 116th. 9 large rooms, 4 baths, river view. Address Box 1006, The New Republic, or phone BOgardus 4-1349.

POSITION WANTED

TEACHER: French, German and Spanish—20 years experience in private High Schools. Qualified N. Y. Regent's. Excellent pronunciation. Address: Box 1007, The New Republic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED